The American Ecclesiastical Review

Vol. CXIV, No. 5 May, 1946

CONTENTS

The American Hierarchy of 1846 . *Msgr. Peter Guilday* 321
Specialized Catholic Action Follows the Leader *Joseph V. Sommers, S.J.* 327
Historical Development of the Dogma of the Immaculate Conception . *Francis J. Connell, C.SS.R.* 340
The Vanished Spouse . . . *Thomas Owen Martin* 347
When Did Mary First Know of Her Divine Maternity? *Dominic J. Unger, O.F.M.Cap.* 360
Meditation After a Sick Call . . *Francis J. Barrett* 367
Time and Pope Leo . . . *Joseph Clifford Fenton* 369

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS

Touching the Chalice at Ordinations 376
The Mass of the Angels at the Funeral of a Child . . 377
By Way of Amplification 377
The Feast of the Titular of a Church on June 30, 1946 . . 378
Requiem aeternam and *Requiescat* at Funerals . . . 379
Adults in Limbo 380

Contents Continued on Next Page

Published monthly by The Catholic University of America Press, Washington 17, D. C. Subscription price, currency: United States, $4.00; Canada, $4.50; Foreign, $5.00. 40 cents per copy.

Entered as second class matter, November 30, 1944, at the Post Office at Washington, D. C., under the Act of March 3, 1879. Accepted for mailing at the special rate of postage provided for under Act of March 5, 1930, under Act of February 28, 1925.

Business communications, including subscriptions and changes of address, should be addressed to The American Ecclesiastical Review, The Catholic University of America Press, Washington 17, D. C

Please address all manuscripts and editorial correspondence to The Editor, The American Ecclesiastical Review, Box 20A, The Catholic University of America, Washington 17, D. C.

Copyright 1946, by The Catholic University of America Press

Contents Continued from Previous Page

The Priest at a Non-Catholic Funeral 381
Civil Prohibition of Marriage 382
Sermon Stories 383

ANALECTA 384

BOOK REVIEWS

Journey in the Night, *by Fr. Brice, C.P.* 388
Mind the Mass, *by Rev. Joseph A. Dunney* 389
Fact and Fiction in Modern Science, *by Henry V. Gill, S.J.* 390
Chunking Listening Post, *by Mark Tennien* 391
Eastern Catholic Worship, *by Donald Attwater* 391
The Splendor of the Rosary, *by Maisie Ward* 392
Psychologia in Usum Scholarum, *by G. Esser, S.V.D.* . . 393
Self Revelation of the Adolescent Boy, *by Urban Fleege, S.M.* 395

BOOK NOTES 397

BOOKS RECEIVED 399

Timely and Practical
SUGGESTIONS

NUMBER ONE:

From time to time, your parishioners may ask what would be an appropriate gift for a newly ordained priest. Perhaps you ask yourself the same question.

What better gift, within a reasonable price range, could you suggest, entirely in keeping with the man and his life purpose than: A Subscription to *The American Ecclesiastical Review?* We shall gladly send an appropriate gift notice.

Why not keep this in mind?

NUMBER TWO:

Do you bind your copies of *The American Ecclesiastical Review?* If you intend to do so, we can supply you with such copies as may be missing from your set, at the following rates:

1-10 years back.....45c ea.
11-20 years back.....50c ea.
21-30 years back.....60c ea.
31-40 years back.....70c ea.
41 years and up.....80c ea.

Address: **Business Manager**
The American Ecclesiastical Review
c/o Catholic University of America Press
620 Michigan Avenue, N. E. Washington 17, D. C.

THE AMERICAN HIERARCHY OF 1846

Bishop Shahan once remarked that of all the Marian literature he had read the one book which should be brought up to date and reprinted was the *History of the Devotion to the Blessed Virgin Mary in North America* by Father Donald Xavier Macleod (New York, 1866). Father Macleod was one of that gallant band of American Tractarians who entered the Church in the 'forties and 'fifties. An Episcopalian minister, he was a member of the Brotherhood of the Holy Cross, founded by Levi Silliman Ives, Bishop of the Episcopalian Diocese of North Carolina. Bishop Ives was received into the Church by Pius IX in 1852. Soon after his conversion, Macleod began his studies for the priesthood in Mt. St. Mary's of the West and was ordained by Archbishop Purcell in 1860. His priestly work was spent in and around Sedamsville, Ohio. While on a sickcall, he was struck by a railroad train and killed, June 30, 1865. Archbishop Purcell's *Memoir* says of him: "Devotion to the Blessed Virgin, and zeal for her honor, was the ruling passion of the soul of Rev. Mr. Macleod. He was her client, her son, her knight, her priest."

The *History,* published in 1866, is a treasure-trove of Marian theology and Marian American history. Scarcely a town, a city, a river, lake or mountainside where Mary's name is still preserved has been forgotten by the pious author. Some names he passes over in sorrow because they have been forgotten and he laments most of all the loss of the name "River of the Immaculate Conception," which Father Marquette first gave to the Mississippi.

The peak of Mary's glories in the United States Father Macleod considers as the action taken by the Sixth Provincial Council of Baltimore in 1846. He writes: "What wonder, then, that in her own sweet month of May, the Fathers of the Council of 1846 held in Baltimore—twenty-two bishops, with their theologians—should solemnly elect as Patroness of the United States of America the

Blessed Virgin Mary, immaculately conceived? The Fathers had been trained in her honor, they had lived for her service, they decided to add to the crowning glory of their life-long prayer and praise, and at the same time to show their zeal for the true interests of this country, by entreating her protection for it in this eminent and public way."

Three years had passed since the Fifth Provincial Council had been held (1843). No period in American history was so potent with disorders arising from an ever-increasing animosity toward Catholicism. By 1846, religious liberty had reached its lowest ebb. Many of our cherished traditions of civil and religious equality had been overthrown in violent outbreaks, as in Philadelphia in 1844. Every large civic center with a noticeable Catholic population suffered from the Native Americans of that day. Catholics in all parts of the United States were saddened and dismayed; and they instinctively looked to the coming Council in Baltimore for leadership out of the miasma that anti-Catholic forces had raised in the land. And yet, one seeks in vain in the *Acta et Decreta* of the Council of 1846, or in its Pastoral Letter to the Clergy and Laity, for any expression of sorrow for all that Catholics had suffered during the preceding three years. Nor was the coming War with Mexico, in spite of its anti-Catholic tinge, which was declared while the Council was in session, so much as mentioned. The issue (May 16, 1846) of the *New York Freeman's Journal,* which carried an account of the Council, printed also the declaration of war on Mexico.

Apparently, problems more important than anti-Catholicism occupied the minds of the Prelates of 1846—the erection of new Sees to meet the ever-increasing demands of the Church owing to the westward movement, the organization of the Church in the former Republic of Texas, the special care of Catholic men in the military services of the United States and growing demands of Catholic secondary education.

Only four decrees were enacted in the Council of 1846, three of a

domestic nature and the fourth proclaiming its decision, with the permission of the Holy See, to declare Mary Immaculate America's Patroness. The Pastoral, issued at the close of the Council, carried the message:

> We take this occasion, brethren, to communicate to you the determination unanimously adopted by us, to place ourselves and all entrusted to our charge throughout the United States, under the special patronage of the holy Mother of God, whose immaculate conception is venerated by the piety of the faithful throughout the Catholic Church. By the aid of her prayers, we entertain the confident hope that we will be strengthened to perform the arduous duties of our ministry, and that you will be enabled to practise the sublime virtues, of which her life presents a most perfect example. The Holy Ghost, by her own lips, has foretold that all generations shall call her blessed; and we can not doubt that a blessing is attached to those who take care to fulfil this prediction. To her, then, we commend you, in the confidence that, through the one Mediator of God and men, the man Christ Jesus, who gave himself a redemption for all, she will obtain for us grace and salvation.

Of the twenty-six members of the hierarchy listed in the *Catholic Almanac for 1846,* twenty-three were present and signed the decrees. The venerable dean of the American episcopate, Benedict Joseph Flaget, was absent owing to his great age—he was then in his eighty-third year; Bishop Benedict Fenwick of Boston was then in his last illness—he died on Aug. 11, 1846; and Bishop Frances N. Blanchet who was about to be elevated to the Archiepiscopal See of Oregon City (July 24, 1846) was absent "owing to the great distance of his residence from Baltimore."

The *mise-en-scene* at the opening of the Council in the Baltimore Cathedral on May 10, 1846, is one to arouse considerable interest, even a century later. Eight of the prelates were born in the United States—one in Boston (Fitzpatrick), one in Brooklyn (McCloskey), one in Bardstown (Reynolds), one in Vermont (Tyler), and four in Maryland (Eccleston, Fenwick, Miles, Chance); one

in Canada (F. N. Blanchet), one in Belgium (Lefevre), one in Switzerland (Henni), and eight in Ireland (F. P. Kenrick, P. R. Kenrick, Michael O'Connor, Andrew Byrne, William Quarter, John B. Purcell, John Hughes, and James Whelan). Of these, two were Vincentians, two were Dominicans, and four were Sulpicians. One, Bishop Michael O'Connor of Pittsburgh, resigned his post in 1860, to enter the Society of Jesus. The remaining prelates were of the diocesan clergy. The youngest prelate at the Council was Bishop Fitzpatrick of Boston, who was thirty-four. Four others were in their thirties, ten were in their forties, eight were over fifty, and the oldest was in his sixtieth year. Archbishop Eccleston, who presided, was forty-five years old. Nine of the bishops were to be elevated to metropolitan Sees within the next decade.

Their theological training was as diversified as their places of birth and represented studies here in America, and abroad in the Urban College de Propaganda Fide at Rome and Issy. Some of them had been professors in American seminaries, particularly in Mount St. Mary's, Emmitsburg. One of the Fathers of 1846, Bishop Francis Patrick Kenrick of Philadelphia, was to become internationally known as one of the leading theologians and biblical scholars of the century. One interest common to all the prelates was the progress of Catholic journalism. There were at this time seven weeklies—*United States Catholic Miscellany* (Charleston, S. C.), *Catholic Telegraph* (Cincinnati), *Catholic Herald* (Philadelphia), *Catholic Advocate* (Bardstown), *Wahrheitsfreund* (Cincinnati), *New York Freeman's Journal and Catholic Register,* and *Le Propagateur Catholique* (New Orleans). There were two literary reviews—*The United States Catholic Magazine and Monthly Review* (Baltimore) and *Brownson's Quarterly Review.* The *Ordo Divini Officii Recitandi* and the *Metropolitan Catholic Almanac and Laity's Directory* came out annually.

The following table of the *status ecclesiae* appeared in the *Almanac* for 1846:

SUMMARY OF THE CATHOLIC CHURCH IN THE UNITED STATES

DIOCESSES	Churches	Other Stations	Clergymen on Missions	Clergymen Otherwise Employed	Ecclesiastical Institutions	Cler. Students	Institutions for Young Men	Female Religious Institutions	Female Academies	Charitable Institutions	Population
Baltimore	51	20	57	24	4	52	4	5	5	27	90,000
New Orleans	47	..	43	11	1	19	1	4	3	6	160,000
Louisville	43	75	28	24	3	9	3	4	10	4	30,000
Boston	38	15	41	4	..	..	1	..	..	1	65,000
Philadelphia	65	..	54	3	1	30	4	1	5	4	.....
New York	114	30	106	5	1	13	1	1	4	16	200,000
Charleston	21	50	20	1	1	4	..	2	3	6	10,000
Richmond	13	..	12	..	..	..	..	..	1	2	.....
Cincinnati	70	50	63	11	1	19	1	4	5	5	65,000
St. Louis	43	25	43	30	4	39	2	10	9	7	.....
Mobile	12	30	12	1	1	7	1	1	4	7	11,000
Detroit	19	16	18	..	..	..	..	..	1	2	40,000
Vincennes	50	..	28	7	1	20	2	1	5	5	25,000
Dubuque	13	11	9	..	..	..	1	1	2	1	6,000
Nashville	5	20	7	..	1	3	1	..	1	..	1,500
Natchez	5	16	4	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	.....
Pittsburgh	41	..	27	..	..	8	1	1	2	2	30,000
Little Rock	5	10	4	1	..	3	..	..	..	..	700
Chicago	40	..	21	1	1	..	1	..	..	1	50,000
Hartford	8	..	8	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	.....
Milwaukee	23	19	18	..	1	7	..	..	1	1	25,000
Ap. Vic. Or. T.	14	..	16	1	..	..	1	1	2	1	7,500
Dio.,21,V.Ap.,1	740	437	641	121	21	238	25	36	63	97	816,700

"If we add to the above estimate of the Catholic population, the supposed number of Catholics in the remaining dioceses, we shall have 1,062,700."

Owing to the death of Pope Gregory XVI on June 9, 1846, there was some delay in acknowledging the *Acta et Decreta* of the Council. On Sept. 15, 1846, Cardinal Fransoni, then Prefect of the Sacred Congregation de Propaganda Fide, wrote to our Prelates praising the Council for its decree on Mary Immaculate as Patroness of the American Church. This letter contained a decree from Pius IX granting the petition and permitting priests to celebrate the feast on Dec. 8.

Had Pius IX been free at the time (he was in exile in Gaeta), he might have accepted the invitation of Archbishop Eccleston to come to Baltimore to preside over the Council of 1849. It would have been an auspicious beginning to his long and fruitful relationship with the American Church. On March 8, 1849, the Pope wrote to Archbishop Eccleston:

> As you have signified your earnest wish, that we should assist at the Provincial Council, which you are about to hold, according to custom, with our other venerable brethren, the bishops of the United States of America, be assured that nothing could afford us more pleasure, nothing could be more grateful to our heart, than to enjoy the presence and conversation of yourself and the same venerable brethren, to embrace you all with affection, to express to you the sentiments of profound regard which we entertain for each one of you, and to congratulate you upon the pastoral zeal for which you are distinguished, and the well-known solicitude with which you labor so assiduously, in the discharge of your functions, to extend the glory of God, to promote our most holy religion, and to secure the salvation of the beloved flocks committed to your care. But, as in the existing times and circumstances, it would be impossible for us to comply with your invitation, as your wisdom will easily understand, venerable brother, we request you to make known to the prelates these sentiments of our mind, and to inform them of the apostolical benediction, which from our inmost heart we affectionately impart to you, to them, to all your faithful people.

To the historic glory of the Fathers of 1846 must ever belong the filial action they took to declare Mary, the Immaculate Queen of Heaven, the Patroness of the Church in our beloved land. Three years later (1849), the Seventh and last (national) Provincial Council formally made the declaration of 1846 a decree and at its close instituted for the first time the *Acclamation:*

BEATISSIMAE VIRGINI MARIAE,
SINE LABE ORIGINALI CONCEPTAE,
HARUM PROVINCIARUM PATRONAE,
HONOR AETERNUS.

PETER GUILDAY

The Catholic University of America,
Washington, D. C.

SPECIALIZED CATHOLIC ACTION FOLLOWS THE LEADER

"Each situation will have then its corresponding apostle: the apostles of the workers will be workers; the apostles of the farmers will be farmers; the apostles of the seamen will be seamen; the apostles of the students will be students."[1] "This is the method which must be followed. These apostles will be better understood in the milieux to which they address themselves, if they themselves have come from those milieux. And there you have a vital point of all Catholic Action."[2]

It is by the application of this principle that during the past twenty years the Young Christian Workers of Belgium and France have become a model for the specialized movements of Catholic Action around the world.[3] Movements patterned after them are now formed among students, farmers, business and professional men. These movements are well established in some fifteen countries, including England, Ireland, and Australia. And in our own country promising beginnings are spreading among workers and students. Here they exist in more than sixty cities and towns, with the greater number of sections located in parishes and schools of the Mid-western and New England states. They are becoming known to us as Young Christian Workers, Young Christian Stu-

[1] Discourse of Pius XI to Pilgrimage of the A.C.J.F., May 1, 1934. Quoted from *What does the Pope Say about Catholic Action?* (Sydney: Pellegrini, 1937), p. 30.

[2] Discourse of Pius XI to International Union of Catholic Women's Leagues, April 13, 1934. *Ibid.*

[3] No matter how fully in all other respects these specialized movements may conform to the papal directives, nevertheless, they are simply not Catholic Action unless they have received the *bishop's mandate.* This is a *sine qua non* of official Catholic Action. As a matter of fact, these movements have received this mandate in quite a few other countries, as well as in several dioceses of the United States. For the sake of convenience, however, in this article the specialized movements are spoken of as Catholic Action. Nor do we use the term as referring to these movements modelled on the Young Christian Workers in an exclusive sense, as if they alone could be true and genuine Catholic Action. For other forms of official Catholic Action can and do exist.

dents, and Catholic Action Farmers—or even simply as "Catholic Action cells."[4]

The natural reasons for the success and spread of these movements lie in their joyous spirit of charity and conquest, their well-knit system of organization, and their psychologically sound techniques.

We have also the very high praise awarded their prototype by Pius XI: "We have defined Catholic Action in a manner which is *perfectly interpreted by the Young Christian Workers*" (Sept. 1929). "We offer this movement as a model for Catholic Action" (Aug. 1933).[5] The supernatural reasons behind their growth and the urgent need of spreading the movement among workers were pointed out by Pius XII. Writing as Cardinal Secretary of State, our present Holy Father referred to

> . . . the astounding results of a movement on which Providence seems to have set its seal. If we consider for a moment the great and admirable work it has achieved we cannot help seeing in it the power of God. . . .
>
> It is of extreme urgency, in order to arrest the progress of evil and to win back the souls of the workers, to extend and intensify to a still greater degree the Providential movement of the Young Christian Workers.[6]

Yet without the diligent assistance of priests specialized Catholic Action "can neither begin, nor prosper, nor bear its proper fruit." In America, in particular, priests are needed who know well the spirit, organization, and techniques of these movements. To help in part to fill this need the present article is written.

AIM OF SPECIALIZED CATHOLIC ACTION

The specialized movements apply the general aim of Catholic Action to their particular vocational group. They pray and act to make the workers, farmers, students, and business men better

[4] Cf. *Catholic Youth Directory* (Washington: N.C.W.C., 1944), pp. 52 f., 60 ff.

[5] Cf. Vincent Rochford, *The Young Christian Workers* (London: Burns Oates, 1943), pp. 67 f.

[6] Letter to Cardinal Verdier, Jan. 29, 1937. Translated from *La documentation catholique,* XXXVII (1937), 829, col. 390.

Catholics if they are already members of the Church, or if they are not, to convert them. Thus their work is, as Pius XII worded it, "to cooperate in the salvation of souls, and to continue across space and time the redemptive work of Jesus Christ."[7]

It is not the precise aim of these different movements to work for the preservation of faith and morals in their members; rather their goal is primarily apostolic. They wrestle with the evil forces of the world to win souls for Christ. Not that they do not seek after personal holiness. For them this is the normal condition for a fruitful apostolate.

Since in real life there is no human action that does not have a moral or religious aspect, every deliberate phase of man's existence must be lived according to the Christian pattern. Each branch of specialized Catholic Action works to nourish or implant Christian customs and institutions in its field of influence.

THE ORGANIZATIONAL STRUCTURE

To bring about the Christian renewal of the *whole of life,* Catholic Action movements must guard against enrolling workers or students in organizations formed *alongside* their daily life; rather Catholic Action organizations must be *within* the work-a-day structure of daily living. Therefore, the nucleus of every parish or school section is a "cell" of leaders from one environment, each of whom works through a "team" of three or four helpers chosen from among his friends and acquaintances. This structure enables the members to penetrate their surroundings with their sanctifying influence in order that every action at home, at work, at school, and at play, may be informed by Christian principles.

Members of Catholic Action thus extend the beneficent work of priests to their home and place of work and recreation. They must realize that it is according to God's eternal providence that they live in such a neighborhood and work in such a factory or go to such a school. They carry Christ into these environments, because His Divine life is in their souls, His Divine truth on their lips. Christ wills *through them* to permeate these environments, to insert His Life into every section of human society.

[7] Discourse to Italian Catholic Action, Sept. 4, 1940. Quoted from William Ferree, S.M., *Introduction to Catholic Action,* Revised ed. (Washington: N.C.W.C.), p. 92.

If the members of these organizations were gathered together merely for prayer or for play, this grouping along vocational lines might not be required. But because Catholic Action aims at restoring *every phase of daily life* to Christ, this arrangement according to broad vocational categories is a practical necessity.

THE PERVADING PRINCIPAL OF LEADERSHIP

Yet specialized Catholic Action could not accomplish its task successfully, unless it strove to build its organizational structure around the *natural* leaders of neighborhood and parish. How experience has impressed this lesson upon the members themselves is exemplified by an event that occurred in France. A YCW section was having no influence because it did not include the natural leaders of its neighborhood. A youth concerned tells the story:

> For a whole year we worked. We were the willing type, but lacked a leader; it was impossible to start a section. We prayed to our Lord to give us the leader we needed.
>
> At 9:35 one night we went to his house. He was getting ready for bed when we arrived, but welcomed us. I said to him: "If you wish, you can save many souls. If you refuse to help us, many souls will be lost. Please think it over and pray. In three days come and tell me if you will give yourself to the YCW."
>
> He came with "yes" as the answer; became president of the section, and an outstanding militant of the federation.[8]

The same necessity for centering the apostolate around the natural leaders is appreciated in our own country. Thus in Chicago the leaders' bulletin for high school girls ran a notice to this effect: "If you're not having an influence on the lives of those about you, then you're not a leader. Since there must be a leader in the gang you go with, persuade her to get into the cell, and you move out onto a team."

Specialized Catholic Action avoids the artificial procedure of imposing leaders upon a group from without. Rather it wins to its ranks the natural leaders found in factory, hospital, and farmstead. Its well-knit system of organization, running from parish section through diocesan council up to national committee, depends primarily upon the selection and training of the natural

[8] L. Berne, S.J., *Lumière nouvelle* (Paris, 1939), pp. 102 f.

leaders who work in a railroad yard, or clerk in a bank, or mine soft coal.[9]

TWO PERIODS OF FORMATION[10]

In the training of leaders we can distinguish two more or less clearly defined periods: The first, the preliminary formation; the second, the period of formation properly so-called, produced by the practice of the specialized method and the life which this imposes upon the militants. ("Militant" is found commonly in literature of the movements as a synonym for a Catholic Action "leader" or cell member.)

The leaders' chief training and their greatest power for good come only when the movement as such—by its organization, its method, its programs—enters into the formation of these lay apostles. The cell meetings, the inquiries, the exchange of views on the Gospel, services, team-work, preparing speeches, organizing section activities and regional meetings, arranging days of recollection and retreat—each of these help to complete the formation of the militant.[11]

Hence it is very clear that Catholic Action does not enlist the leaders merely as isolated individuals who might work independently, at cross-purposes, or without helpers. It operates through a carefully elaborated organizational set-up and a detailed system of techniques.

Yet in the making of a lay apostle nothing is more fundamental than to begin well. Therefore, instead of explaining the whole

[9] Cf. Henri Roy, O.M.I., *The Jocist Movement* (Manchester, N. H.: JOC, 1944), pp. 45-60. These pages outline the organization of the YCW. For the interrelation of the various specialized movements, cf. Joseph Charbonneau, *Catholic Action* (South Bend: Apostolate Press, 1943), pp. 40 ff.

[10] In substance and outline the remaining part of this article is much indebted to a series of articles by Germain M. Lalande, C.S.C., that appeared periodically from Sept., 1941 to April, 1943, in *Cahiers d'action catholique* (Montreal: Centrale de la J. E. C.). Fr. Lalande's excellent articles on "Le Problème des Chefs" are soon to be published in book form by Fides. They have already appeared in an English summary (Catholic Action Reprints nn. 29, 30) published by the National Commission of Catholic Action Students of N.F.C.C.S. at the University of Dayton.

[11] For an adequate treatment of these points cf. Stephen Anderl and Sister M. Ruth, F.S.P.A., *The Technique of the Catholic Action Cell Meeting*, 2nd ed. (LaCrosse: St. Rose Convent, 1943).

organizational structure and the full system of techniques employed by the specialized movements modeled on the Young Christian Workers, we shall confine the remaining part of this article to the initial task of selecting the leaders and of giving them their preliminary formation. These are the first, all-important steps; and a consideration of them, moreover, will reveal much of the characteristic spirit of the entire movement.

At the very beginning this preliminary work will devolve entirely upon the chaplain himself; later when he can count on formed militants to do the job, he will do best to use them to gain others.

SEEK AND SELECT THE NATURAL LEADERS

"It is your chief duty, Venerable Brethren, and that of your clergy, to *seek* diligently, to *select* prudently, and *train* fittingly these lay apostles amongst workingmen and amongst employers."[12] Thus did Pius XI outline the care that priests should employ in discovering and preparing the leaders. To find them we must sift and screen the environment; that is to say, we must study in detail the make-up and the attitudes of the parish or school to discover who those are who exercise a wide influence.

The environment cannot be sized-up without long and minute examination. Fr. Lalande remarks:

> We are easily led to imagine that we know the environment and the leaders who guide it. All those who have consented to make an attentive study of an environment have always had their notions upset.
>
> We could mention many cases of patient and laborious examinations that revealed the preponderant yet unsuspected influence of people who, at first glance, did not seem to count at all.
>
> It is the cooperation of such people we must be sure of if we wish to transform the environment.[13]

In this search for leaders it is necessary to keep in mind the type of cell members we are looking for. They are not the goody-goodies. The *Catholic Action Priests' Bulletin* from Rochester, N. Y.[14] guides us in picking them:

[12] *Quadragesimo anno.* Quoted from *Catholic Mind,* XXIX (1931), 11, p. 303 (Italics inserted).

[13] Lalande, *op. cit.,* n. 12 (Sept., 1941), p. 22.

[14] Cf. Vol. I, nn. 2, 3.

(1) They should have sound common sense in ordinary matters. This is an indispensable natural quality upon which with God's help we can build the supernatural. But we can never give natural good judgment, if it is lacking.

(2) The prospective militants must be in and of their environment. They should stand apart, in no essential, from those with whom they associate in daily life. They must be one of the gang. They must belong.

(3) The crowd in which they move must accept them as their leader. What the "gang" thinks in this matter is worth ten times what we, on our own, might think. The leaders of the crowd will usually have courage and imagination and strong convictions, giving them drive and power, making them aggressive and enthusiastic.

One chaplain picked his first leaders among high school boys by getting into a "pick-up" football game and managing the affair for a while. Then he faked a turned ankle, and watched from the sidelines to see who would take over. The two quarterbacks later became his first militants.

LET THE LEADERS LEAD

Once the leaders have been found, the chaplain must actually permit the leaders to lead, and not merely pretend to do so. It is the priest's task to form and inspire the leaders. Regarding the relative position of priest and layman in the associations of Catholic Action, Pius XI remarked: "The priest Assistants of Catholic Action will represent the authority of the bishops, and, while *leaving to the laity the direction and responsibility of the associations,* they themselves will have to be responsible for the interpretation and the constant and faithful carrying-out of the principles and directives established by the Hierarchy."[15]

To neglect to use these leaders *as leaders*—which is too often done—is to neglect to use the providential instruments which God has placed there for the good of the environment. It is to misuse the leaders, to make robots of them. It is to fail to motivate and train them as free and intelligent collaborators in the aposolate.

[15] Letter to Colombian Hierarchy, June 20, 1934. Quoted from *What Does the Pope Say,* p. 38.

Worse still, if they are not given their due measure of leadership, they are usually lost to the movement.

THE GIFT OF THEMSELVES

Once the natural leaders are discovered it would be childish to imagine that they are going to throw themselves into the apostolate of their surroundings on a simple invitation or after a reminder that they are leaders and that consequently they must work for the full Christianization of their fellows. The discovery of the leaders is the first step. It remains to form them and get them working for Christ.

Often the natural leaders in an environment will have a bad spirit and will be leading their companions to evil rather than to good. It is the precise function of Catholic Action to conquer and reorientate them. Canon Joseph Cardijn, dynamic founder of the Belgian YCW, says: "We always have to begin by taking the militants just as they are: whether they are Socialists or Communists, it does not matter. . . . We must not look for militants ready-made. We don't find them that way; we form them."[16] A fictitious example of this might be taken from the movie, *Going My Way*. For "Tony," turkey-thief turned choirmaster, is a leader of cell quality.

This initial formation is the most difficult and yet quite indispensable. The later formation, given through the full life and organization of the movement, will almost always crumble if it has not this previous foundation to build on.

In angling for leaders we must not ask them to *join* a specialized movement of Catholic Action. If we proceed in this fashion they will get the idea that the association has something to give them. The primary reason why leaders became members of Catholic Action is not to receive but to give. Their adherence is stronger the more they give to others. This conception of the lay apostolate as primarily *the giving of oneself* is so essential that, no matter how completely he is part of the external organization, no one really belongs to the soul of Catholic Action so long as he has not grasped this in practice. Catholic Action gives to others according to what it receives from the militants of the cell and the members of the

[16] *Semaine d'Étude Internationale de la J. O. C.* (Bruxelles, 1935), p. 156.

teams who consecrate themselves to the service of their companions. It organizes their gift, makes the giving easier and more effective by the strength of its organization; but Catholic Action offers no privileges.

IN THE SERVICE OF THEIR FELLOWS

Hence, adherence to these movements must not be made by mere enrollment, but rather by a conversion of mind and heart to the ideal proposed by the movement. The more anyone shares this ideal, the more he is impelled by the desire of co-operating in the redemption of his environment, the more he is part of Catholic Action — provided he integrates his action with the organization which has been mandated by the Bishop of the diocese to work for this end. From the start, therefore, we must *get the leaders interested in their environment and engage them in the service of their fellows.* Experience furnishes abundant proof that the real militants in all the specialized movements are those who were led to devote themselves to the service of their fellows from the start, even before "Catholic Action" was mentioned to them.[17]

Such was the method used by a well-trained YCW "cell" organized in one of our reformatories. When these leaders planned the remodeling of the inmates' chapel, they persuaded the prospective members to help build the altar, remodel chairs and kneelers, and paint the ceiling and walls during their precious free time. The conversion of these new men to the service of their fellows was their engagement to Catholic Action, and it was by this that they grasped the real spirit of the movement which they later joined. Whether it is a question of getting leaders to work with a group already active, or of starting a new group, the first thing to do is to turn the leaders to the service of their companions.

When they begin to serve, undreamed-of opportunities for charity will turn up. I have had young student leaders tell me that they had never, before preparing for Catholic Action, thought of giving candy to others than their friends, of inviting the kid with whom few wanted to play into a handball game, of giving up their right to a seat in a crowded cafeteria so that another could be seated. These are little services which will pave the way for the great service of Catholic Action, which is to save souls.

[17] Cf. Lalande, *op. cit.*, n. 14 (Nov., 1941), p. 115.

THE LEADERS MUST LEARN TO SEE FOR THEMSELVES

They will not serve until *they* see the need. It is helpful to begin with something concrete. We should start from their everyday life; for it is in the actions and surroundings of their daily life as workers, as students, as farmers, that they will and must be lay apostles. For many natural leaders Catholicism either has never been, or has ceased to be, a *life;* it is at best only a conglomeration of pious practices and laws, in themselves good, yet emptied of their profound meaning because they are not related to the daily routine of life. Hence we must discuss with the prospective leaders the factories, warehouses, offices, movies, dance-halls, school and home, where real life is lived and where the issue of the eternal destiny of their fellows is decided. Facts will not be lacking to illustrate the religious ignorance, the selfishness, dishonesty and impurity of a large part of youth. These conditions call for sympathy and action. Some leaders will see the problems and take steps to remedy the evils. From that time on they are true militants.

This habit of seeing the problem and searching for a Christian solution will be developed more fully through the systematic "social inquiries" carried on in the regular weekly cell meetings. There the leaders examine some particular problem, judge it in the light of Catholic principles, and plan remedial action.

If we do not bring the youth thus to examine their environment, they may become errand-boys for the chaplain; but they will never learn to think things out for themselves, and so they will never come to feel deeply and act energetically.

AROUSE THE LEADERS' SENSE OF RESPONSIBILITY

The chaplain errs tragically by holding all judgment and responsibility to himself. Rather he must work to create in the leaders a sense of *responsibility for making their fellows happy* in time and in eternity. It can and must be brought home to the leaders that they have the responsibility of giving Christ to their little world of home and work and play. This obligation is based upon the dogma of the Mystical Body, the precept of Christian charity,

and the duties arising from Baptism and Confirmation.[18] Although this obligation rests on all Catholics, the responsibility of natural leaders is greater because of the influence they exercise on others.

This sense of responsibility is developed not just by inculcating the duty of the apostolate, but mainly through the reflective contact of the leaders with the lives of their fellows, with their difficulties, problems, duties, sorrows. Gradually (perhaps after six months or a year) the leaders begin to see the *spiritual* distress of their brothers and sisters in Christ. They realize the repercussions this may have on their happiness here and especially hereafter, and are filled with a true pity for them.

Thus the leaders are brought to feel a desire to relieve the burden of their brothers, to serve them, to bring more happiness into their lives — in short, to make the life of all their companions more beautiful, more Christlike.

To win a leader means to stimulate him to realize his responsibilities towards his fellows and to arouse his generosity to be of service to them. We must not desist until he is haunted by a feeling of responsibility for souls. He must be taught to think of his own environment enough to recognize for himself what must be done to bring to pass its full Christianization. His sense of responsibility will be deepened when he assumes formal charge of a team and his helpers in the apostolate look to him for support and guidance.

THE APOSTOLATE REACTS

Canon Cardijn insists that the formation of leaders must be accomplished *"in and through action."* "Many in all the specialized movements of Catholic Action have declared," says Fr. Lalande, "that they never felt the desire to transform themselves until the day when they discovered the condition of the environment and their capacity of influence."[19]

In this work it is a psychological error first to turn the leader inwards towards himself and his personal improvement rather than outwards towards the service of his fellows. It is true that one

[18] Cf. Luigi Civardi, *A Manual of Catholic Action* (New York: Sheed and Ward, 1943), pp. 58-71. Cf. also Pius XII, *The Mystical Body of Christ* (New York: The America Press, 1943), p. 43.

[19] Lalande, *op. cit.*, n. 16 (Jan., 1942), p. 206.

must be a Christian in order to christianize others. But the desire to make his fellows more fully Christian is the highest trump-card to decide a leader to work at his own personal holiness. And in almost all cases the discovery of the distressing conditions of the environment starts the work of self-improvement. It can, for instance, make even a "rough and tumble" leader recognize the incomparable value of the state of grace.

As they get further into the movement itself, obstacles, delays, and failures reveal to the leaders their own helplessness without grace. They come to the conclusion that a Chicago high school student reached: "We must have *real saints* in the movement to carry us all over the rough spots." Instinctively they turn to Christ in order to get His help and to imitate Him. They become conscious of how little they know Him, and they go to the Gospel in order to study Him. This is the moment when they seriously begin to examine their religion anew, trying to apply it to their own life and surroundings.

Thus the apostolate reacts and drives the leaders to the knowledge and love of Christ and to the intensification of their own Christian formation. Their spiritual outlook will not be self-centered, but Christo-centric—centered in the whole Christ, Head and members.

TO SUM UP

In the making of a lay apostle nothing is so important as to begin well. To do this we must keep in mind that the specialized movements of Catholic Action are primarily apostolic and aim to lead the people of each environment to think, feel, will and act in a Catholic way. The psychology of their method is to interest the natural leaders in the betterment of their own particular environment and to engage them in the service of their fellows. Through its systematic techniques and powerful organization specialized Catholic Action strives to create and develop in its members an apostolic mind, that is, a sense of personal responsibility to Christ for the environment of their everyday lives.

We may well sum up the matter in the words of Fr. John La-Farge. He writes: "If we follow what seems to be the master outline of Catholic Action—that which Pius XI described as peculiarly efficacious—we see a small group of well-directed and carefully formed lay leaders, who make a thorough study of conditions

in which they themselves live, move and very likely earn their living."[20]

This study of the environment, it is pointed out, leads to realistic and determined action. Fr. LaFarge goes on to give his evaluation of the beginnings of this work in the United States:

> The heart of Catholic Action lies in the formation of these small groups of lay apostles: a great challenge to priestly ingenuity, charity and zeal.
>
> One of the most encouraging signs of the vitality of the Catholic Church in the United States, it seems to me, is the steady, even if very gradual, increase in the number of young parish priests, curates or pastors of small parishes, who are engaging in just this type of apostolic group formation.[21]

This then is the goal: to form other Christs, lay collaborators in the Redemption, and yet all the time workers, farmers, students; other Christs down there in the slum street and flourescent-lit office, in the studio or on the farm; working youth among working youth, but the gayest, kindliest and most generous among the crowd.[22] We aim to select and train lay apostles who will penetrate where priests cannot, for at the gate to mill, factory and shipyard hangs a sign, "Employees Only Enter Here."

JOSEPH V. SOMMERS, S.J.

St. Mary's College,
St. Mary's, Kansas.

[20] John LaFarge, S.J., "Real Catholic Action Emerges from Fog of Generalities," *America*, LXVI (1942), p. 482.

[21] *Ibid.*

[22] Cf. Vincent Rochford, *The Priest and the Y.C.W.* (Liverpool: Y.C.W., 1940), p. 29.

MISSION INTENTION

"Christian Charity toward All Nations" is the Mission Intention for the month of May, 1946.

HISTORICAL DEVELOPMENT OF THE DOGMA OF THE IMMACULATE CONCEPTION

On May 10, 1846, the Sixth Provincial Council of Baltimore decreed that Mary Immaculate should be venerated as Patroness of the United States, and in February, 1847, this decree was approved by the Holy See. In connection with the centenary of this event, a brief acount of the historical development of the dogma of the Immaculate Conception will be helpful to our clerical readers. It would furnish an appropriate topic for discussion at study club gatherings and in high school classes of religion, since it serves not only to throw light on the particular doctrine of Our Lady's sinless conception but also to illustrate that type of doctrinal development which is acknowledged by the Catholic Church—development which implies no addition to the deposit of divine Revelation but only a deeper understanding on the part of the Church of the truths revealed by God for all mankind.

Theologians are wont to distinguish three stages in the normal development of a dogma which was not contained explicitly in the sources of Revelation. First, there is the period of implicit but uncontroverted acceptance, when the doctrine in question is believed by the faithful only in the sense that they hold a more general doctrine in which it is logically contained, or in the sense that they are accustomed to perform some liturgical or devotional act which presupposes this particular doctrine. The second is the period of discussion and controversy, in which scholars inquire into the validity of the arguments for and against the admission of the doctrine as a truth of Revelation, and study its precise sense and its relation to other doctrines of Christian faith. Naturally, in this stage there are divergences of opinion among theologians. In the third stage the doctrine is accepted by the universal Church and taught unanimously by the authoritative magisterium, or even made the subject of a solemn definition.[1] There is perhaps no truth of Catholic faith that exemplifies this threefold stage more definitely than the dogma of Mary's Immaculate Conception.

It is by no means certain that the doctrine of the Immaculate

[1] Cf. Van Noort, G., *Tractatus de fontibus revelationis* (Bussum, Holland, 1920), n. 230.

Conception is contained, even implicitly, in Sacred Scripture. It is true, the great majority of Catholic exegetes and theologians agree that the words of the Almighty to the serpent after the fall of our first parents—"I will put enmities between thee and woman, and thy seed and her seed"[2]—in their literal sense refer to Mary, attributing to her an unqualified state of hostility to the spirit of evil, which necessarily implies her freedom from all sin, original as well as actual. Yet, there have been Catholic scholars who interpreted the "woman" as Eve.[3] Such an interpretation is not in harmony with the more common traditional exegesis of the text, unmistakably approved by Pope Pius IX, when he asserted that the Fathers and ecclesiastical writers taught that in this text "was clearly and evidently pointed out the merciful Redeemer of the human race, the only begotten Son of God, Jesus Christ, and was designated His most blessed Virgin Mother Mary, and at the same time was expressed in a noteworthy fashion the enmity of both toward the devil."[4] However, it was not the intention of the Sovereign Pontiff to give an authentic interpretation of the text, so that those who refuse to admit in the "protoevangelium" any direct and literal reference to Mary cannot be branded with any censure from the standpoint of the Church's teachings. It should be remembered, too, that some of these scholars believe that this prophecy refers to Our Lady in the typical or spiritual sense, by the intention of the Holy Spirit.[5]

A similar judgment could be passed on the value of the angel's greeting: "Hail, full of grace"[6] as an argument for the Immaculate Conception. Pope Pius IX incorporated it into the Bull proclaiming the doctrine, but laid the primary emphasis on the interpretation given to this text by the Fathers and ecclesiastical writers.[7]

It is therefore in divine tradition, the unwritten word of God, that we must seek the basic and unquestionable source of the dogma that the Mother of God was preserved from original sin in the first moment of her existence. In the words of Pope Pius IX: "The

[2] *Gen.* 3:15.

[3] Cf. Le Bachelet, X., "Immaculée conception," *DTC,* VII, 851.

[4] *Analecta juris pontificii,* I (Rome, 1855), 1214.

[5] Cf. Le Bachelet, *DTC,* VII, 852.

[6] *Luke* 1:28.

[7] *Analecta juris pontificii,* I, 1215.

illustrious monuments of tradition, of both the Eastern and Western Church, most convincingly testify that this doctrine of the immaculate conception of the most Blessed Virgin . . . always existed in the Church, as received from those who lived before and as marked with the character of a revealed doctrine."[8]

In the first three centuries of Christianity nothing approaching an explicit mention to Mary's immunity from original sin can be found in ecclesiastical writings. However, a significant parallelism was employed by several of the early writers—the Eve-Mary comparison. As an extension of the Pauline contrast between Adam and Christ,[9] they developed an antithesis between the woman who shared in the fall of our first parent and the woman who shared in the reparation of that fall. St. Justin (100-167) was the first to develop this comparison: "While still a virgin and without corruption, Eve received into her heart the word of the serpent and conceived thereby disobedience and death; but Mary the Virgin, her soul full of faith and joy, replied to the angel Gabriel who brought her the happy message: 'Be it done to me according to thy word.' To her was born He of whom so many things are said in the Scriptures . . ."[10] Other writers who make use of the same comparison are St. Irenaeus (130-202) and Tertullian (160-240).[11]

The pertinent element of the comparison, as far as the Immaculate Conception is concerned, is the statement that Eve was free from corruption when she was addressed by the serpent; and by freedom from corruption is meant something more than virginity. By implication it would seem to follow that Mary too was free from all corruption when she was greeted by the angel, and if this be understood in an unqualified sense, it includes freedom from original sin. Evidently the argument is not conclusive, but it justifies the assertion that vestiges of the doctrine of the Immaculate Conception can be found in the writings of the first three centuries.

Beginning with the fourth century, more numerous and more definite testimonies are discovered. The writers emphasize the

[8] *Ibid.*, 1214.

[9] Cf., for example, *Rom.* 5:19.

[10] *Dial. cum Tryphone*, 100 (*MPG*, VI, 710).

[11] St. Irenaeus, *Contra haereses*, V. 2, 1 (*MPG*, VII, 1179); Tertullian, *De carne Christi*, 17 (*MPL*, II, 782).

holiness of Mary, a holiness commensurate with her great dignity as Mother of God. Thus, St. Augustine (354-430), writing against Pelagius who had adduced a number of persons presumably sinless (in support of his contention that human nature was not corrupted by original sin) pointed out that these persons were actually not without fault, but he added the qualification "except the holy Virgin Mary, of whom, for the honor of the Lord, I wish to raise no question when discussing sin."[12] Apparently, the holy Doctor was referring to actual, rather than original, sin; yet the basis of his argument for Mary's holiness, the divine maternity, would logically lead to the conclusion that she was free from original sin also.

However, it was chiefly because of St. Augustine's insistence on the universality of original sin that the testimony of the Western writers, accepted literally, would, as a general rule, exclude Mary from the privilege of a sinless conception. They insisted that only Jesus Christ was free from original sin, because He alone was conceived without the stain of carnal concupiscence.[13] This tendency to link the "deordination" of active conception with the transmission of original sin greatly influenced post-Augustinian Western writers and prevented them from drawing the completely logical conclusion of their general doctrine that Mary received from the Most High a degree of sanctity in accordance with her dignity. Yet, occasionally one finds a statement by one of the Western writers which closely approaches a recognition of Mary's Immaculate Conception. Thus, St. Maximus of Turin (380-465) stated: "Mary was a worthy dwelling for Christ, not because of the qualities of her body, but because of her original grace."[14]

Among the writers of the Eastern church, who were not so intimately affected by the Pelagian controversy on original sin, a less restrained attitude toward Mary's perfect sinlessness can be perceived. An example of this is the fervent apostrophe of St. Ephrem (306-373) to the Mother of God: "Full of grace . . . all pure, all immaculate, wholly without sin, wholly without stain, wholly without reproach . . . virgin in soul, in body, in spirit."[15]

[12] *De natura et gratia*, c. 36 (*MPL*, XLIV, 267).

[13] Cf., for example, St. Leo, *Sermo XXV in nativitate Domini*, V, 5 (*MPL*, LIV, 211).

[14] *Homilia V* (*MPL*, LVII, 235): "Idoneum plane Maria Christo habitaculum, non pro habitu corporis, sed pro gratia originali."

[15] *Oratio ad Deiparam, Opera graece et latine*, III, 528, 529.

St. Andrew of Crete (650-740) even uses the expression "holy conception" in reference to Our Lady.[16] St. John Damascene (676-749) exclaimed: "O admirable womb of Anne, in which developed and formed little by little an infant all-holy."[17] Such passages as these have led Fr. M. Jugie, A.A., the outstanding authority in Oriental theology, to declare that the Byzantine writers explicitly acknowledged Mary's Immaculate Conception.[18] And, although not all would admit this claim, it is very evident that the writers of the East were nearer to the truth than those of the West in the patristic period. A feast in honor of the conception of St. Anne was in existence in the East as early as the eighth century; and although the primary purpose of this feast seems to have been to commemorate a legendary announcement to St. Anne that she was to bear a daughter, the idea that the very conception of this child was in some way holy seems also to have been intended.

The second period in the development of this doctrine, the period of discussion and of controversy, began in the twelfth century. In the year 1138 St. Bernard (1091-1153) wrote a letter to the canons of Lyons, protesting against the celebration of a feast they had begun to observe in honor of Mary's conception.[19] Only the Word Incarnate was free from original sin, he asserts, though Mary was sanctified before birth. Attempts have been made to explain the words of St. Bernard as not actually denying the doctrine of the Immaculate Conception as it is proclaimed today; but such interpretations must necessarily do a certain amount of violence to the literal meaning of his words.

Similarly, if the words of St. Thomas Aquinas (1225-74) be taken at their face value, he was an opponent of the doctrine of Mary's sinless conception, although there have been capable scholars who believed that the Angelic Doctor in reality held the doctrine. At any rate, if St. Thomas denied this privilege to Our Lady, it was not through any failure on his part to recognize the dignity and the holiness of the Mother of God; it was simply because he deemed it derogatory to the universal mediatorship of

[16] *Canon pro festo Conceptionis S. Annae* (*MPG*, XCVII, 1309).

[17] *Hom. in nativ. Deiparae* (*MPG*, XCVI, 672).

[18] *DTC*, VII, 935.

[19] *Ad canonicos lugdunenses Ep. 174* (*MPL*, CLXXXII, 332).

Christ that any mere creature should not be redeemed by Him from the stain of original sin, actually contracted.[20]

In any event, the opinion denying to Mary the prerogative of a sinless conception was more common among the scholastics of the twelfth and thirteenth centuries. Even the great Franciscan writers of that period, Alexander of Hales (1185?-1245) and St. Bonaventure (1221-74), held to this more common doctrine.[21] But toward the end of the thirteenth century the theological attitude toward the question became more favorable to the doctrine of Mary's sinless conception. Credit for the inauguration of this movement is usually ascribed to Scotus (1266-1308), and the *Doctor subtilis* undoubtedly was the most influential leader of this trend; but it should be noted that before him the Franciscan, William of Ware (+ c. 1300), and Blessed Raymond Lull (1232-1315), a Franciscan tertiary, also defended the doctrine of the Immaculate Conception,[22] and it would seem that Scotus was influenced, at least by the former, in the stand he took in defence of Our Lady's complete immunity from sin.[23]

In a comparatively short time, the balance of theological thought came to favor the doctrine. Pope Sixtus IV, on Feb. 28, 1476 and again on Sept. 4, 1483, in pontifical pronouncements gave approval to the belief in Mary's Immaculate Conception, to the extent of referring to her conception as "wonderful," and of vigorously condemning those who claimed that this belief was heresy.[24] The Fathers of the Council of Trent in 1546 stated that in their declaration on original sin they did not intend to comprehend Our Lady.[25] Pope Pius V in 1567 condemned the proposition of Baius which asserted that no one save Christ was free from original sin.[26] Pope Paul V in 1617 and Gregory XV in 1622 (at the instance of the Spanish kings, Philip III and Philip IV) forbade the denial of the Immaculate Conception in public sermons and writings,[27] and

[20] *Sum. theol.*, III, q. 27, a. 2, ad 2.

[21] Alexander of Hales, *Summa theologiae*, III, q. 9, m. 2; St. Bonaventure, *In IV sent.*, L.III, dist. 3, p. 1, a. 1, q. 2.

[22] Cf. Le Bachelet, *DTC*, VII, 1060 ff.

[23] *In IV sent.*, L. III, dist. 3, q. 1.

[24] Cf. *DB*, 734, 735.

[25] Cf. *Ibid.*, 792.

[26] Cf. *Ibid.*, 1073.

[27] Cf. Le Bachelet, *DTC*, VII, 1172.

Pope Alexander VII in 1661 relegated to the Index writings which would call into doubt this pious belief or the feast or the cult, and also stated explicitly that the object of the feast is to celebrate the sanctification of Mary's soul in the first instant of its creation and infusion into the body. At the same time the Pope forbade anyone to condemn those holding the opposite opinion as guilty of heresy or mortal sin.[28]

We can regard the third period of the development of the doctrine as beginning with the constitution of Alexander VII, for although the Immaculate Conception was not yet a matter of faith, it was well-nigh the unanimous belief and preaching of the Church. And so, the ground was well prepared for the culminating act, the solemn definition of the dogma proclaimed by Pope Pius IX.[29] It should be noted that, in order to avoid even the least shadow of imprudence, the Pope had written five years previously to all the bishops of the Catholic world, asking their views on the definability of the doctrine. According to a printed report of 1854, of 603 bishops who replied, only 56 or 57 were opposed to the definition, and the opposition of about a half of these was based on grounds of expediency rather than on doctrinal reasons. Only four or five frankly declared themselves definitely opposed to the definability of the doctrine, among whom was Msgr. Sibour, Archbishop of Paris.[30] And so, as the most glorious deed of his long pontificate, Pius IX, on Dec. 8, 1854, solemnly pronounced it an article of divine-Catholic faith that the most blessed Virgin Mary in the first instant of her conception was preserved immune from all stain of original sin, by virtue of the merits of our Saviour, Jesus Christ. Four years later the seal of heaven's approval of this declaration came in the form of the apparitions of Lourdes, when Mary identified herself to a little peasant girl, Bernadette Soubirous, under the name of this glorious prerogative: "I am the Immaculate Conception."

FRANCIS J. CONNELL, C.SS.R.

The Catholic University of America,
Washington, D. C.

[28] Cf. *Ibid.*, 1175; *DB*, 1100.

[29] Cf. *DB*, 1641.

[30] Cf. Le Bachelet, *DTC*, 1198.

THE VANISHED SPOUSE

(N.B. *The case itself, and the characters named and portrayed, are entirely fictional, being used only to illustrate a simple procedure in this matter.)*

The housekeeper roused Father Wall from his contemplation of the evening paper to tell him that there was a rather nervous young woman waiting in the parlor to see him. Crumpling the paper and dropping it on the floor the tired pastor heaved himself out of his easy chair, buttoned his cassock and went toward the parlor grumbling to himself. His face relaxed, however, when he saw that the young woman was a recent convert of his, Jane Harriman.

"Oh, Father, I don't know what to do!" exclaimed the young woman, as soon as he entered the room.

"There, there, child, what's the trouble?"

"Well, you know that Chet, my husband, and I did not get on any too well the last time he was home. I told you all that when I was taking instructions. After he went overseas he wrote suggesting that I get the divorce. I had it before I started taking instructions. Since then I have been working in the war-plant here in town, as you also know, and in the plant I got acquainted with a foreman in my department, a nice young Catholic fellow, and now—we've fallen in love. I know it isn't right, and I'm still married in the eyes of the Church, but isn't there something you can do for us?"

"What about Chet, your first husband?" asked Father Wall, thinking to himself that here was another headache about to begin.

"He's been reported 'missing in action.' I don't know what has become of him, whether he is dead or not. Of course, if he were dead then we could go ahead and get married all right, couldn't we? There wouldn't be any trouble then, would there?"

"If he were dead, of course, and we had definite knowledge of his death, you would, of course, be free to marry. Since he is 'missing' we are not certain that he is dead, so we can't go ahead and let you get married. After all, Jane, marriage is for keeps, you know, even though a lot of people don't like to play it that way in this country. People should not run around from one marriage to another."

"But, Father, in the instructions you mentioned how the Church does sometimes fix these things up for people. I thought you could, maybe, do the same for us. Ray, the man I am interested in now, and I talked it over and he said maybe if Chet was not baptized it would make a difference."

"I see. He was no doubt referring to the Pauline Privilege. Here, I'll read the text to you: 'But to them that are married, not I but the Lord commandeth, that the wife depart not from her husband. And if she depart, that she remain unmarried, or be reconciled to her husband. And let not the husband put away his wife. For to the rest I speak, not the Lord. If any brother hath a wife that believeth not, and she consent to dwell with him, let him not put her away. And if any woman hath a husband that believeth not, and he consent to dwell with her, let her not put away her husband. For the unbelieving husband is sanctified by the believing wife; and the unbelieving wife is sanctified by the believing husband: otherwise your children should be unclean; but now they are holy. But if the unbeliever depart, let him depart. For a brother or sister is not under servitude in such cases. But God hath called us in peace. For how knowest thou, O wife, whether thou shalt save thy husband? Or how knowest thou, O man, whether thou shalt save thy wife?' That is what St. Paul writes in the First Letter to the Corinthians, seventh chapter, verses 10 to 16."

"You see," continued Father Wall, "St. Paul says that the Lord commands you not to leave Chet, and if you do, to remain unmarried or be reconciled to him. Even if Chet was never baptized, that does not mean that you can put him away, as St. Paul says, if he consents to dwell with you. It is only in case Chet 'departs,' that is to say, refuses to be converted or at least refuses to live with you without causing you to commit mortal sin, that you can be free to contract a new marriage."

"But, Father, Ray and I want to get married, and we still feel the Church ought to do something for us. I don't love Chet any more, and besides we're divorced anyway. Why can't Ray and I get married now? He's 'missing' and may never come back. Do I have to wait until he is definitely dead? Isn't there any one who can do something for us."

"Well, since this is a marriage question, you could go to the

city and see the priests in the Chancery Office. The Chancellor, or the Vice-chancellor, might be able to tell you where you stand. I imagine they will tell you about the same thing I have, but you can go to see them if you like. I'll give you a letter of introduction and the certificate of your Baptism to take along. You'd better take your marriage certificate and divorce decree, too."

Jane Harriman entered the waiting room at the Chancery Office and gave her name to the receptionist. Father Wall had called the day before to tell the Chancellor that the girl was coming and to give him some idea of what the case was all about. As soon as the other people who were already waiting to see the Chancellor had had their turn, she was shown into his office.

He took the letter of introduction from Father Wall which the girl carried with her, and asked her in general about her case. From what she said it appeared that this was a case of seeking to apply the Pauline Privilege, or one of the extensions thereof, involving no question other than whether or not the factual situation described by St. Paul actually existed in the present circumstances, so that the Bishop could authorize the interpellations.[1] There did not appear, on the face of it, to be any such question as would require recourse to the Holy Office.[2] The Chancellor, therefore, summoned the Vice-chancellor who took care of matters pertaining to the Pauline Privilege.

In the office of the Vice-chancellor Jane told her story in more detail. She explained how she had first met Chet Harriman, how long they had gone together, and her acquaintance with his family. She herself, she said, was not a church-goer when she first met him and all during their courtship he had never, so far as she knew, gone to church, either. She did not recall that they had ever talked about religion. She had wanted a church wedding so she could wear a white gown with a train. He had objected and suggested that they just go down to the Court House, but when she had insisted that a girl ought to get married in a white dress with a train in a church he had given in.

His parents were not particularly religious. She thought they went to church occasionally, but she was not sure what church they

[1] Cf. Can. 1122, § 1.

[2] Cf. Can. 247, § 3.

attended, for the times when she had been to visit them they had never gotten up on Sunday mornings to go to church. She did not really know whether Chet had ever been baptized, because she had never thought to ask him about it, but she did not feel that he had been, because the family were not regular church-goers. That would make a difference, wouldn't it?

Chet had been living with an aunt in the city where Jane met him, and they had been married just before he went into the service. She handed the Vice-chancellor the certificate of their marriage and he noted that a minister had performed the ceremony, so she had had her church wedding, as she had wanted.

The last time she had seen her husband, Jane continued, was when he had come home on a furlough shortly before he went overseas. She had thought at the time that he acted rather cool toward her, and that he did not seem to care for her companionship as he had when they were first married, but she had thought only that he was tired and under a strain from the training he was going through. Now, after reading the columnists who answer questions in the paper she realized that it was probably just a case of a war-time marriage wearing off. They had thought they were in love, because of the pressure of war-time which makes people snatch at happiness, and then when they were married they had found out that they did not love each other after all.

After Chet got overseas his letters were more and more irregular, but she had ascribed that to the distance and the difficulties of getting mail through. He was in Australia and there were stories of American soldiers marrying Australian girls, but they had been married such a short time that she had not thought that he could be tired of her already. Then, too, he had moved on from Australia to go into combat, and then he could not write regularly, of course, so she had not worried too much about the letters.

Then, all of a sudden, with no previous warning she had received a letter from Chet, written from a hospital in Australia, where he had been returned from the combat zone. In it he said that he wanted her to get a divorce, that their marriage had been all a mistake, and that he did not want to go on with it. She had been completely desolated by this letter. In her despair she had turned to a girl she knew, a Catholic, who worked at the machine next to hers. This girl had been a wonderful pal. She had com-

forted Jane, and best of all, she had taken Jane to church with her a few times, and there Jane had found such peace as she had never known before.

She had gotten the divorce as Chet had requested. After all, if he didn't want her any more there was not much that she could do to hold him. She had felt pretty low, while the divorce was going through, and afterwards. Being kicked out of a man's life was not pretty, no matter how you looked at it. She had gone on working, sleeping, and eating, but she had not felt real, somehow. The Catholic girl, however, had stood by her, and had continued to take her to church from time to time.

It seemed as if the only place she knew any peace in that period was in church, even though she knew she did not belong there. Finally, she had felt impelled to speak to someone about this. The Catholic girl had then taken her to Father Wall, who was simply wonderful. He had been so kind to her, and when she had asked about what Catholics believe he had explained it all so well and made it so easy to understand that she just knew she had to join the Church.

About six months ago she had been baptized in the Catholic Church and had made her First Holy Communion, and she had been so happy ever since. She produced the certificate of her Baptism, which Father Wall had given her to bring along to the Chancery Office, and the Vice-chancellor took it, looked it over, and put it down on his desk and returned his attention to the nervous face of the young woman.

There was a foreman in the plant where she worked, Ray Warburton was his name, who was very nice, Jane said, and little by little she had been attracted to him. He had met her coming out of church one Sunday morning and they had walked down the street a bit, after they had recognized one another, chatting about things in general. This meeting had been followed by others until they were dating regularly. Then she had told him her story and they had tried to figure out what they could do about the situation.

At the time she had gotten the divorce as Chet suggested, she had not thought that she would ever again want to put herself in a position where a man could break her heart. Now, however, she did want to marry Ray, if she could. There would be no difficulty as far as the law was concerned, of course, for she had her divorce from Chet. She handed the decree of divorce to the

Vice-chancellor who put it on the desk along with the baptismal certificate, after glancing at it hurriedly to see that everything was in proper form.

It was after she had met Ray and begun to fall in love with him that word had come that Chet was missing in action, and she wanted to know whether that would make some difference in her situation. She knew that the Church did not approve of divorce, and she and Ray had been worried about what they could do since she was a divorced woman, and they could not marry in church in that case, and they did not want to get married by a Justice of the Peace, either. But now that Chet was missing in action, wasn't there something the Church could do for them? They did not know just what might be done, but they had heard that sometimes Catholics were able to marry if the one who had been married before had not been baptized at the time of that marriage.

The Vice-chancellor wanted to know whether Chet had ever been baptized, and who would know about it. He asked Jane, therefore, for the names and addresses of Chet's parents and of his aunt with whom he had lived when he left home to get a job. As for the time after he had married Jane, she knew that he had never gone through a ceremony of Baptism. She also gave the names of the outfits with which he had served in the Army, so that the Vice-Chancellor could check with the Military Ordinariate as to the possibility of Chet's Baptism while in service.

Jane said that when she was about to be baptized in the Catholic Church, Father Wall had investigated to see whether she should be baptized, as he had said "conditionally," she was not too certain just what that meant, but Father Wall, she knew, had obtained information from her parents, who were still living, that she had never been baptized before. The Vice-chancellor was pleased to know that at least that much of the work had already been taken care of, and that he could write to Father Wall for a statement as to her non-baptism until she was baptized a Catholic.

Turning to his typewriter, the Vice-chancellor composed a petition to the Bishop asking that authorization be granted to proceed to the "interpellations,"[3] or, in the alternative, that he dispense from the "interpellations" on the ground that this was a case in which the extended privilege of Canon 1125 applied. This

[3] Cf. Can. 1122, § 1.

petition Jane signed, and the Vice-chancellor witnessed the signature.

When the petition was laid on top of the certificate of baptism which she had brought, her certificate of marriage, and the decree of divorce, the Vice-chancellor asked Jane to send him the letters from Chet suggesting that she get the divorce and the notice she had received from the War Department saying that he was "missing in action." When she promised to do this he showed her to the door, saying that he would take care of the rest of the investigation and that she would hear from him, through Father Wall, as soon as he had anything to report.

After the girl had left the Vice-chancellor returned to his desk, lighted a cigarette, and proceeded to draw up an outline of what he had and what he still needed for this case. To make his report to the Bishop on the matter he would have to get the statements of Chet's father, mother, and aunt, as to his Baptism or non-baptism. He would also have to get Father Wall's statement as to the fact that Jane was unbaptized prior to her Baptism in the Catholic Church. He blessed Father Wall mentally for having had the foresight to make such an investigation before proceeding to baptize the girl. Now they had a record as to that, at least, which had been obtained at a time when there would be no suspicion of falsification to make it easier for her to contract the marriage which she now desired.

He had her statement as to the fact that she and Chet had not gone to church during the time of their marriage, but after all, that had not been very long, for he had been away in the Army most of that time. He would have to find out from the Ordinariate whether Chet had ever been baptized in the Catholic Church.

He had the divorce decree, so that her freedom to marry again, as far as the state laws were concerned, was established, and she would be able to go ahead and contract this marriage if the Church sanctioned it, without having to worry about being prosecuted on a charge of bigamy.

Looking up the addresses of the parents and aunt of Chet Harriman, the Vice-chancellor found that all of them lived in other dioceses. He called in a stenographer and dictated letters to the Chancellors of those dioceses requesting aid in securing their statements as to the Baptism or non-baptism of Chet, indicating the points on which they would most likely have information.

This was merely a case of helping the Bishop decide whether or not he should authorize the "interpellations" and not a formal trial, so it did not seem necessary to take formal depositions on interrogatories and cross-interrogatories.

He also dictated a letter to Father Wall requesting the information in his hands as to the non-baptism of Jane Harriman prior to her conversion to and Baptism in the Catholic Church. A further letter to the Military Ordinariate requesting information as to a possible record of Baptism of Chet Harriman, he added to the foregoing.

As the responses came in from Father Wall and from the Military Ordinariate, along with the letters from Chet to Jane and the notice from the War Department, he placed them in the folder marked "Jane Harriman" in the file drawer which bore the title "Pauline Privilege (current)" to await the completion of the dossier.

Some three weeks later the statements of Chet's parents and aunt arrived. They were in substantially the same form, and reading them the Vice-chancellor found that the father, having been duly sworn deposed and said: (1) that he was the father of Chester A. (Chet) Harriman; (2) that Chet had resided with his parents until he was eighteen (18) years of age; (3) that during that time, while the parents had nominally belonged to the——— Church of———they had not been in the habit of attending church services regularly; (4) that while the parents had talked about having Chet baptized they had put it off while he was small, though for no particular reason, they just had not gotten around to it, and then had decided to wait until he grew up and let him decide for himself to what church he wanted to belong; (5) that to his knowledge Chet had not been baptized during the time that he resided at home with his parents, and had never cared much about going to church after they stopped making him go to Sunday School; (6) that so far as he knew or had reason to believe Chet had not been baptized after he left the home of his parents.

There was the usual attestation of the priest who had been appointed as Notary to obtain this statement, to the effect that he was acquainted with Mr. Harriman. He said, too, that he had administered the oath to Mr. Harriman after he had made certain that the affiant understood the nature thereof, and that the statement had been made freely and in a straightforward manner. He added

that he, the Notary, considered Mr. Harriman worthy of belief in this matter.

A similar statement from Chet's mother was enclosed in the same envelope. The two statements did not read so much alike as to suggest collusion, and that of the mother contained the additional information that she had not heard from Jane Harriman, her daughter-in-law, since the divorce. The mother considered the divorce unfortunate, for Jane had seemed to be a very nice girl, and she had been very sorry when Jane showed her Chet's letter suggesting a divorce. Of course, they were both very young when they were married, but it did seem a shame that they should separate before Chet came home. She added, too, that Chet was missing in action. He had been a good boy and she hoped that he was all right.

The statement of Chet's aunt was practically the same as those of the father and mother. She stated that during the time that Chet had lived with her he had not gone to church and had not been baptized during that period, or she would certainly have known about it. She stated further that Chet and Jane had been married in church by a minister of the————faith, but that was because Jane had insisted on a church wedding. So far as she knew Jane was not a member of that church and she knew for certain that Chet was not. Had he had his way they would have gone to the Court House, where there would be less fuss and bother. Chet never was one to fuss much, but Jane had wanted to wear white and have a church wedding so the boy had given in. He had left for camp within the week, and Jane had gone with him, but had returned after a short time. She had said that she could not find a decent place to live near the camp and that Chet had suggested that she might "better go home than try to live in that dump" she finally did find to live in.

Taking up Father Wall's statement, the Vice-chancellor found that it contained an outline of the procedure he had followed to determine whether he should baptize Jane absolutely or conditionally. He had statements from her parents, which he enclosed, to the effect that they were happy that Jane was entering the Church and was to be baptized. They were quite apologetic about the fact that they had neglected to have it done in the past. They had just kept putting it off, and then had decided to let her choose

for herself when she was older, whether she would like to be baptized or not. They themselves did not profess any religion, but if Jane wanted to be a Catholic, why it was quite all right with them, and they hoped she would be very happy in her new church.

The letter from the Military Ordinariate stated that a search of their records revealed no Baptism of Chester A. (Chet) Harriman by a Catholic chaplain.

Lining up the documents in his possession, the Vice-chancellor then prepared his report to the Bishop to accompany the petition which Jane Harriman had signed when she talked to him. It was on this basis that the Bishop would make his decision whether or not to grant the rescript authorizing the "interpellations." The report showed:

(1) Petition of Jane Harriman, convert to the Catholic Church, for authorization for the "interpellations," or, in the alternative, for a dispensation from the "interpellations" on the ground that the extended privilege of Canon 1125 applied to her case;

(2) Certificate of baptism of Jane Harriman in the Catholic Church;

(3) Statement of Father Wall as to her previous unbaptized condition;

(4) Statements of her parents as to her previous unbaptized condition;

(5) Certificate of her marriage to Chester A. (Chet) Harriman;

(6) Statement of Chester's father as to his unbaptized condition;

(7) Statement of Chester's mother as to his unbaptized condition;

(8) Statement of Chester's aunt as to his unbaptized condition;

(9) Statement of Jane Harriman as to their non-attendance at any church during the time of their marriage;

(10) Letters of Chester to Jane suggesting that she get a divorce because he did not want to go on with the marriage;

(11) Decree of divorce between Chester and Jane Harriman;

(12) Notice from the War Department to Jane Harriman that Chester was "missing in action."

To the foregoing outline of the documents and statements collected that the Bishop might be able to decide whether or not to grant the rescript authorizing the "interpellations," or, in the

alternative, dispensing therefrom on the grounds that the extended privilege of Canon 1125 applied, the Vice-chancellor added his *votum.*

In this *votum* he summarized the facts and the law applicable in this fashion:

In facto. (a) Jane Ord, unbaptized, contracted marriage with Chester A. (Chet) Harriman, unbaptized, on the ..... day of ....., 194....., in the presence of Rev. ....., but for no particular reason of religious belief. (b) Chet Harriman subsequently suggested that Jane get a divorce, though she does not appear to have given him any "cause" for such a suggestion. (c) She obtained the divorce. (d) After the divorce she was converted to and baptized in the Catholic Church. (e) At the present time Chet Harriman is listed as "missing in action."

In iure. (a) A lawful marriage between unbaptized persons, though it be consummated, is dissolved in favor of the faith on the basis of the Pauline Privilege (Can. 1120, § 1).

(b) This privilege is excluded in case the marriage was entered with a dispensation from the diriment impediment of Disparity of Worship (Can. 1120, § 2), but there was no such dispensation, and consequently no such exclusion of the privilege in the present case.

(c) Before the spouse who has been converted and baptized can contract a new marriage validly, that spouse must, except for the prescriptions of Canon 1125, ask the party who is not baptized: (1) whether that party wishes to be converted and receive Baptism; (2) whether that party at least is willing to live with the convert peacefully without "contumely of the Creator" (Can. 1121, § 1).

(d) These "interpellations" must always be made, unless the Holy See has declared otherwise (Can. 1121, § 2).

(e) The "interpellations" are to be made regularly, in at least summary and extrajudicial form, on the authority of the Ordinary of the spouse who has been converted, and this Ordinary is to grant to the unbaptized party, if he shall have asked it, a delay to allow him to deliberate on the matter, warning him however, that if the time granted for such deliberation passes with no result the answer will be presumed to be in the negative (Can. 1122, § 1).

(f) "Interpellations" even privately made by the convert are valid and, indeed, are likewise licit, if the form prescribed above

cannot be followed; but in this case there must be proof thereof, for the external forum, from two witnesses at least, or from some other lawful method of proof (Can. 1122, §2).

(g) If the "interpellations" on the declaration of the Holy See have been omitted, or if the unbaptized party has answered in the negative expressly or tacitly, the baptized party has a right to contract a new marriage with a Catholic person, unless the baptized party has after Baptism given the unbaptized party just cause to depart (Can. 1123).

(h) The points regarding marriage in the constitutions of Paul III, *Altitudo,* 1 June 1537; St. Pius V, *Romani Pontificis,* 2 Aug. 1571; Gregory XIII, *Populis,* 25 Jan. 1585, and which were written for particular places, are extended to other regions also in the same circumstances (Can. 1125).

(i) In the constitution *Populis* (Doc. VIII, Code) mention is made of persons who having contracted marriage while unbaptized with an unbaptized person, are captured and carried off to places so distant from home and from their spouses that it is impossible after conversion has taken place to make the "interpellations." This impossibility may arise either because there is no way to communicate with them when their whereabouts are known, or because there is no information as to their whereabouts. In such cases the Ordinary, among others, is given faculties to dispense from the interpellations.

Conclusion. Since the factual situation for the use of the Pauline Privilege exists in the present case, and since the departure of the unbaptized party was not due to some just cause being given by the baptized party, and since the interpellations cannot be made because the unbaptized party is "missing in action," it is suggested that a dispensation from the "interpellations" be granted.

After looking over the report and questioning the Vice-chancellor about certain points, the Bishop took the petition and wrote thereon, "Dispensation granted in virtue of Canon 1125."

When the Bishop had signed his name the Vice-chancellor witnessed the signature and noted the date. He then returned to his office and summoning a stenographer dictated a letter to Father Wall to notify him that Jane Harriman could proceed to contract marriage in the Church with Ray Warburton, whereby her marriage to Chester A. (Chet) Harriman would be dissolved (Can. 1126). In this letter he enclosed the letters from Chet which she

had furnished him and the notice from the War Department, along with her certificates of Baptism and marriage and her decree of divorce. The statements from Jane's parents regarding her non-baptism he also sent back for the pastor's files. The rest of the documents relative to the case, including the petition with the notation by the Bishop thereon that the dispensation was granted, he put into the file drawer marked "Pauline Privilege (complete)" for a record of what had been done in the case.

THOMAS OWEN MARTIN

The Catholic University of America
Washington, D. C.

FIFTY YEARS AGO

In the May, 1896, issue of *The American Ecclesiastical Review,* Fr. Brandi, S.J., concluding his series of articles on "The Union of the Churches," a rejoinder to the Greek Patriarch of Constantinople, gives numerous quotations from early writers to prove that the Eastern church of the first nine centuries recognized the primatial authority of the Roman Pontiff. . . . Msgr. Anton de Waal writes on the origin of certain portions of the Canon of the Mass, such as the extension of the hands at the "Hanc igitur," and the words incorporated in the form of consecration, "mysterium fidei." . . . Bishop Maes gives a detailed description of seminary life as he believes it should be regulated in our country, recommending particularly that the seminarians regularly teach catechism in the parochial schools. . . . Alfred Loisy contributes an article on the disciples of Emmaus (The sad tragedy of Loisy's later years is emphasized by the realization that he was once recognized in Catholic circles as an outstanding exegete). . . . An explanation is given of an instruction of the Holy See to the Apostolic Delegate, granting permission, under certain conditions, to Catholics who had joined the Odd Fellows, the Knights of Pythias, or the Sons of Temperance, to retain their membership in a limited degree, even after their reconciliation with the Church. . . . We find a latent humor in a reply to a question, which states that priests may use the working men's dispensation from abstinence, *if they belong to the laboring class.* And a reference is made to the words of St. Paul: "In fact, I have labored more than any of them" *(I Cor.,* 15:10).

F. J. C.

WHEN DID MARY FIRST KNOW OF HER DIVINE MATERNITY?

This *Review* recently carried a criticism of an article in which the Rev. E. F. Sutcliffe, S.J., tried to prove that Mary did not know that Jesus was truly God until some time after finding Him in the Temple.[1] Fr. Sutcliffe quoted two writers of the Church in favor of his opinion, and because of these two he says his opinion is not new and "does not lack high authority." Since the opinion proposed goes against the commonly accepted view, as Fr. Sutcliffe admits, it might be well to examine the testimony of the two Doctors upon whom he relies.

Venerable Bede, when commenting on the story of the finding of Jesus in the Temple, seems to say that Mary and Joseph did not know that Jesus was divine. But what has he to say about Mary's knowledge of the nature of her Child *before* this scene in the Temple?

For Venerable Bede both the titles "Son of the Most High" and "Son of God" used by the angel in the message of the Annunciation, undoubtedly express the divine Sonship of Mary's Child.[2] He inveighs against Nestorius for going against such a clear testimony and denying such an open truth, namely, that Jesus is God and that Mary is the Mother of God. Does Mary realize that, according to Bede? That seems so obvious to him that he does not have to express it; for Mary heard these clear titles and they were meant for her more than for Nestorius. Besides, according to Bede, she was not an illiterate girl. She had read the Scriptures and knew the prophecies. From the prophecy of *Isaias* 7:14, she knew that the Messias would be born of a virgin, even though she did not know how.[3] Because of her knowledge of the prophecies she was able later to compare them with what had actu-

[1] Cf. *The American Ecclesiastical Review,* CXII (1945), 441-44. The article criticized was in *The Month,* CLXXX (1945), 347-50.

[2] Cf. *In Lucam,* lib. 1 (*MPL,* XCII, 317 and 319 B). The same interpretation of these two titles is given in *Homiliae,* lib. 1, *homil.* 1 *in festo annunciationis B. M. V.* (*MPL,* XCIV, 11 D and 13 A).

[3] Cf. *In Lucam,* lib. 1 (*MPL,* XCII, 318 C).

[4] Cf. *ibid.* (335 D and 336 A).

ally happened concerning her Child.[4] Surely, then, she also knew that the prophesied Messias would be God. That was as clear in Isaias as the prophecy about the virgin-mother.

The correctness of our inference is borne out by the clear words that Venerable Bede puts in the mouth of Mary as an amplification in her *Fiat:* "She says, 'May he be conceived in a virgin without the seed of man; may he be born of the Holy Spirit, (her) flesh remaining intact; may the Holy (thing) which will be born of the woman who will be a mother without the cooperation of a human father, be called the Son of God.' "[5] So Bede has Mary say: "May he be called the Son of God." But according to him that title expresses divine Sonship. Consequently Mary knew before her consent to be mother that her Child would be God.

On the story of the Visitation the English Doctor comments: "[Elizabeth] calling her the mother of her Lord, because she understood that she [Mary] was bearing the Redeemer of the human race in her womb."[6] If he uses the title "Redeemer," he does not thereby agree with some modern scholars that "Lord" is merely a Messianic title. A few lines later he amplifies Mary's *Magnificat* thus: ". . . my spirit rejoices in the eternal *divinity* of the same Jesus, that is, of Salvation, whose flesh is begotten by a temporal conception."[7] So, according to Bede, Mary undoubtedly recognized the divinity of her Son while chanting the *Magnificat.*

Zachary too knew that Jesus is God; He called his own son "the prophet of the Most High." That according to Bede means "the prophet of Christ" who is the Most High. He uses this as an argument against the Arians.[8] Now according to Bede, Mary was present for the *Benedictus* of Zachary.[9]

According to Venerable Bede the Magi knew of Christ's divinity: "And falling down they adored him. By no means would they have adored, if they had not believed him to be the Lord."[10] Would Mary who was present be deprived of such intimate knowledge of her Child, which was granted to the Magi?

When beginning the story of the finding of Jesus in the Temple, Bede tells us that the fact that Jesus is God had been approved

[5] *Ibid.* (320 A).
[6] *Ibid.* (321 C).
[7] *Ibid.*
[8] Cf. *ibid.* (326 D).
[9] Cf. *ibid.* (323 C).
[10] *In Matthaeum,* lib. 1 (*MPL,* XCII, 45).

by *manifest* indications of miracles already at His Nativity, even at His Conception; whereas now Jesus Himself began to make known the truth of His divine Majesty.[11] If anyone caught these manifest hints at His Nativity, Mary certainly did. If anyone caught them at His Conception, Mary, who alone was present, did.

As we read on in Bede's commentary, he explains Christ's question, "Did you not know that I must be about my Father's business?" He says that Christ denies that Joseph is His Father and "simply and openly insinuates for us as well as for them who His true Father is." Did they miss this patent insinuation completely? Hardly, for then the purpose that Christ's question had, according to Bede, namely, of getting Joseph to realize what he owes to Christ as *Eternal* Son, would have been lost entirely. So far, then, there seems no doubt that Mary knew Jesus to be divine. Now for the crucial paragraph:

> What an example of piety and at the same time of humility in the Lord! His parents do not understand the word about His divinity which He spoke to them; nevertheless He, not ungrateful of their human concern about Him, when they command, descends and is subject to them . . . and His mother kept all these words in her heart. She stored all the words of the gospel in her heart, both what she understood and what she did not yet understand, as if ruminating upon them and examining them more diligently.[12]

If we take only the first two sentences by themselves, it does seem that Bede denies that Mary and Joseph knew anything of His divine nature even after the revelation Jesus had just made. However, since he admits in the third sentence that Mary understood some of the words that Jesus spoke, and since we saw that he held that she knew of Jesus' divinity already at the Incarnation, we must interpret the first two sentences differently. They can, and taken in the remote context do, mean that Mary had known of Jesus' divinity before this, but she did not grasp all that He was now saying *about* that divine relation of His.

Venerable Bede explained this story of the finding of Jesus also in a homily. There too he says Christ's question is a hint at His divine Majesty. Then he adds:

[11] Cf. *In Lucam*, lib. 1 (*MPL*, XCII, 348 D).
[12] *Ibid.* (350 B).

Whose [Jesus'] example of great piety we must admire much. He saw that His parents did not yet grasp the mystery of His divine Majesty, and still He exercises toward them the subjection of human humility, so that by this humility He might gradually lead them to the acknowledgement of His divinity. For when He said, "How is it that you sought me? . . . they did not understand the word that he spoke to them."[13]

This passage seems to favor Fr. Sutcliffe even more than the one in the Commentary. However, if we do not wish to have St. Bede contradict himself openly, it seems we must say that he means here too they did not realize fully what the mystery of the divine Majesty was. At any rate, since Mary knew at the Annunciation and Visitation that her Child is the Son of God, according to Bede, his testimony in favor of Fr. Sutcliffe is at least doubtful, if in any way tenable.

Of St. Bonaventure's testimony, Fr. Sutcliffe says it is not so explicit as Bede's; still his words "seem to leave no room for doubt as to his opinion" (p. 347). His whole argument rests on the fact that St. Bonaventure uses the word *corripiens,* a "harsh" word, five times in discussing this passage.[14] He would hardly have done so, thinks Fr. Sutcliffe, if he had thought that Mary was aware of Jesus' real dignity.

St. Bonaventure is showing that Jesus was truly humble in submitting Himself to Mary who corrected Him *(corripienti).* That he, however, did not consider this a harsh correction, he himself indicates in this very section when he writes: "She speaks more confidentially and asks the cause of His leaving them, since she knows that she ought to be honored by Him." She is really not reproving; she merely asks for an explanation of His action. This is in place even though she knows He is God. Fr. Sutcliffe assumes that the reproof of Mary is harsh and concludes that she did not know that Jesus was God. Now St. Bonaventure himself does not consider the reproof harsh at all; on the contrary, as he states explicitly in a sermon on this passage of Luke, it was meant to be a sweet word: "Praemittit dulcedinem benigne allocutionis in ore . . ."[15] Moreover, in this sermon he demonstrates Mary's

[13] *Homiliae,* lib. 1, *homil.* 12, *in dom. 1 post epiph.* (*MPL,* XCIV, 65 D).

[14] Cf. *In Lucam,* 2, 48 *(Opera omnia* [Quaracchi], VII, 68 a and b).

[15] *Sermo in dom. infra octav. epiph.,* n. I *(Opera omnia,* IX, 171).

prudence from this question of hers. Twice he calls her "Virgo prudentissima" precisely because of her question of "reproof." So St. Bonaventure hardly considers the reproof harsh; and Mary can be fully aware that Jesus is God and still ask her question.

One might argue more conclusively, perhaps, in favor of Fr. Sutcliffe from St. Bonaventure's statement that Christ's question showed that He was Son of the Eternal Father and the added phrase that this word was occult to them.[16] However, St. Bonaventure does not mean, as might seem, that Jesus hinted at His divinity quite plainly, but they missed the point completely. He has Mary aware of Christ's divine dignity long before this scene.

In the sermon referred to above, the Seraphic Doctor has Mary meet Jesus in the Temple with these words: " 'According to the multitude of my sorrows' which I had on losing thy corporal presence, 'thy consolations made my soul rejoice' on seeing thy face *radiant with divine splendors.*"[17] Note well that Mary is supposed to be saying this. Consequently, in this very scene before Christ revealed Himself, Mary knew that He was truly divine.

According to Bonaventure there is no doubt that the Magi knew of Christ's divine dignity.[18] Now if the Magi knew, would St. Bonaventure deny Mary that knowledge? Even Herod's promise to adore the Child implied that he realized that the Messias would be "the King of the heavens." He feigned the desire to adore the Child in imitation of Mary's adoration.[19] So Mary had known and had adored.

The shepherds knew of Christ's true nature at the Nativity because of the Angel's message to them. They went to the crib, giving testimony to the true Lamb and praising the Saviour of the world, the Incarnate Word, who was the Son of God in flesh.[20] Now if the shepherds were told, why should Mary have remained ignorant? St. Bonaventure tells us explicitly that Mary rejoiced at the birth of Jesus and invited others to rejoice with her because she had given birth to Him who is God, and he puts this chant of the Church on Mary's lips: ". . . placui Altissimo et de meis

[16] Cf. *In Lucam*, 2, 49 (*Opera omnia*, VII, 68 a and b).

[17] *Sermo in dom. infra octav. epiph.*, n. I (*Opera omnia*, IX, 172 a).

[18] Cf. *Sermo in epiphaniam*, n. III (*Opera omnia*, IX, 158 b and 161 a); n. VIII (166 b); n. IX (166 b); n. XII (167); n. XIII (168 a).

[19] Cf. *ibid.*, n. III (159 a); n. II (150 b).

[20] Cf. *Sermo in nativitate Domini*, n. I (*Opera omnia*, IX, 102 b and 103 b).

visceribus genui Deum et hominem."[21] Above we saw that St. Bonaventure holds that Herod feigned the desire to imitate Mary in her adoration of the Child. Mary must, then, have adored Him already at the Nativity.

In his commentary on the Visitation the Seraphic Doctor remarks that it is very praiseworthy and admirable that Mary, who is the Mother of God, should visit the servant of God, Elizabeth.[22] Now if Mary's action is so praiseworthy and admirable, she must have been conscious of her dignity as Mother of God; else where the great humility? St. Bonaventure does not state explicitly that Elizabeth and Mary were aware of Mary's true dignity, but he seems to take that for granted, as something evident in the exclamation of Elizabeth, "Mater Domini mei." In a sermon on John the Baptist, he makes it clear that the Precursor recognized that the "Lord Saviour" had come, and that his knowledge was transmitted to the mother who expressed it prophetically in the words: "And how have I deserved that the mother of my Lord should come to me?" Now in this passage St. Bonaventure speaks also of the Virgin's carrying the "Divine Word" in her womb.[23] Besides, "Lord" is for Bonaventure a divine title that merits adoration for Jesus.[24] If Elizabeth and her son knew that Jesus is divine, would the Saintly Doctor exclude Mary from such a privilege?

Both in his commentary[25] and in a sermon[26] on the Annunciation, the Seraphic Doctor holds that the titles "Son of the Most High" and "Son of God" are strictly divine titles. And even though he does not say explicitly that Mary was aware of the real dignity that these titles proclaimed, he takes that for granted. That is why, when speaking of Mary's consent to the Incarnation, he says: "The angelic annunciation had to precede the Incarnation . . . so that by the announcing [the angel's message], would arouse her to faith, and through faith to consent, and through consent to con-

[21] *Ibid.*, n. III (111).

[22] Cf. *In Lucam*, 1, 43 (*Opera omnia*, VII, 29 b).

[23] Cf. *Sermo de nativitate Joannis Baptistae*, n. II (*Opera omnia*, IX, 544 a).

[24] Cf. *Sermo in epiphaniam*, n. III (*Opera omnia*, IX, 158 b).

[25] Cf. *In Lucam*, 1, 32 (*Opera omnia*, VII, 24 a).

[26] Cf. *Sermo de annunciatione*, n. II (*Opera omnia*, IX, 664 a).

ceive the Son of God through the Holy Spirit."[27] The obvious meaning of this is that Mary consented to be the mother of the *Son of God.* Again, he says, "Nevertheless there is reason on the part of the Virgin who conceived, who as soon as she consented, was filled with the Holy Spirit, and became the *Mother of God, according to what the angel had announced.*"[28] If the angel announced to Mary that she was to be the mother of God, and if Mary gave her consent, she must have understood those titles which told her precisely to what she was giving her consent.

The Seraphic Doctor compares the Blessed Mother at the Annunciation to a bridal chamber in which the Word wedded human nature.[29] By this he does not insinuate that she was unaware of what was going on. Rather she was an intelligent bridal chamber, fully aware of the great ceremony that was taking place. Bonaventure calls the Angel Gabriel the bridesman at this wedding, in which through the love of the Virgin and of God was born the Son of God.[30] All this supposes that God was using Mary as an intelligent instrument who gave her consent with full knowledge of the effects.

To sum up, it seems that, though St. Bede leaves some confusion as to his precise meaning regarding the Blessed Mother's and St. Joseph's lack of understanding of Christ's words, still he made it clear enough prior to that that Mary knew her Child is not a mere man, but also God. Consequently, Venerable Bede can hardly be used as an authority for the opinion that she knew nothing of the divine nature of her Son until later in His life.

As for St. Bonaventure, there seems to be no doubt whatever that Mary knew of her great privilege of being mother of the Son of God long before the scene in the Temple. Certainly, the conclusion from the "harsh reproof" is entirely unwarranted. Even the Fathers and the theologians must be interpreted in the light of immediate and remote context.

DOMINIC J. UNGER, O.F.M. CAP.

Capuchin College,
Washington, D. C.

[27] *In III sent.*, dist. 2, dubium 4 (*Opera omnia*, III, 57 b).

[28] *In III sent.*, dist. 3, pars 2, art. 3, quaest. 2 (*Opera omnia*, III, 93 b).

[29] Cf. *Sermo de annunciatione*, n. IV (*Opera omnia*, IX, 672 a and b).

[30] Cf. *De donis spiritus sancti*, collatio VI (*Opera omnia*, V, 484, 485).

MEDITATION AFTER A SICK CALL

It must be amazingly easy to get thoroughly away from the voice within us called "conscience," sometimes for months, years even. "We are not worried so far. We'll take the responsibility for our actions. They don't bother us." But some day, God help us, we are going to be forced—literally forced—in spite of all we can do otherwise, to face the issue. We are going to be forced to think about what lies before us. All the smooth words of friend or enemy, all our own subterfuges, all our confidence, all our shams will stick in our throat. We shall be left desolate on the threshold of eternity.

Then the little pact we thought we had made with God, whereby He would wink His acquiescence in our little foibles, our sprees, and our wanderings from the right path—this, we shall suddenly understand, was the whole cloth of our own imagination. God had nothing to do with it all the time or at any time. And in this crucial moment, shall we undervalue the mercy of God, the same quality upon which we presumed all the time?

It is not for a priest to say he has seen it work out; it is not for him to say ever, "I told you so." Still, the memory of every priest who comes in contact with this anguish of soul cannot erase a feeling of helplessness that weighs upon him as his heart goes out in compassion for some soul lonely even in the midst of friends; some soul which cannot cross the bar without battling so awful a storm that disaster seems inevitable, and amid the fury of a hundred conflicting winds and torrents cannot catch the voice of God. When the priest knows that, behind those sagging features, such a storm rages, he sends a desperate prayer to Jesus that He will come to this man as he came to Peter across the water, and save him from the depths of eternal damnation, lest he become a derelict for all eternity; or that the Master will calm the strife in his soul as He commanded the gales of the Lake of Galilee to cease their howling; that he make the same prayer as the penitent thief on the cross, for he has stolen from the hall of God's love hours and days filled, like casks, with priceless peace and pleasures, and filled them with the vanishing smoke of empty hours that leave behind only a stale odor. He has buried the talents God gave him; he has wasted his inheritance (the good, his portion of the legacy left him

by the Father through the sacrifice of the Son), and he now finds himself unable to play the role of the prodigal son.

So completely has this man fled the great Lover of all mankind, he thinks, that the sound of footsteps following after seems to him but the hollow echo of Death's awful stride. Death, inevitable, inescapable, coming at last; Death, the inexorable hound of eternity, dogging the footsteps of high and low, so awfully certain of its prey. Having seen the consequences of sin, St. Paul's unselfish charity caused him to offer himself as an obstacle blocking the mouth of Hell. "Lasciate . . ." ". . . Abandon all hope ye who enter here." So awful and terrible is Hell that Dives, the rich man, to whom, during his life on earth, self-denial was a myth and charity or consideration for others a bother and a weakness, wished to return to the world to warn his brothers.

Today I must warn myself, lest preaching to others, I myself become a castaway. When a tooth aches a nerve tells, like a lighthouse warning of shoals, that all is not well within. Therefore, when conscience rebukes, take heed, before the swift shadow of approaching night overtakes and quickly paralyzes the soul. We can drug a protesting tooth, and we can stifle conscience, but the rottenness within shall break down the strongest walls of enamel; they shall crumble like the courage of a soul which has been undermined. "He that hath ears to hear, let him hear . . ." Not without reason has Death been likened to a thief in the night who strikes quickly and unexpectedly under the cloak and cover of darkness. If we think these sayings are hard now, what shall they seem then?

Happy is the man who walks his last brief journey hand in hand with his unseen Saviour.

FRANCIS J. BARRETT

Waterbury, Conn.

POPE PIUS XII AND CHRISTIAN DOCTRINE

The world is suffering from very sad evils, but few are as transcendent as religious ignorance in all its forms. Radical remedies are urgently needed in human society, but few of them are as urgent as the diffusion of the Catechism.

—Pope Pius XII in his Radio Serman of April 7, 1946.

TIME AND POPE LEO

When a well-written, widely read article, manifestly favorable to the Catholic Church, contains serious misstatements about the Church, it is the somewhat unpleasant but still necessary duty of the Catholic priest to indicate, and, in so far as he is able, to correct, these erroneous pronouncements. This duty remains, of course, when the errors in question are not such as to turn the person who is misled by them away from the Church. The duty of contradicting the error stands even in the case where men might be more favorably disposed towards the Church precisely by reason of the error.

Some weeks ago the magazine *Time,* famed for both skilled writing and colossal distribution, carried an article evidently friendly to the Catholic Church but unfortunately containing several inaccurate statements about the Church's history and its present-day activity in this country. Some of these imprecisions were of no great importance. *Time,* like most news magazines, is inclined to paint with a wide brush. No one expects to find on its pages the scrupulous exactitude of a Duchesne, a Batiffol, or a Guilday. In this article, however, one paragraph contains mistakes so serious as to warrant, and even to demand, notice from Catholic priests.

> Vatican and other European clerics had also frowned deeply at the U. S. principle of separation of Church and State, which had been condemned by Leo XIII. But U. S. Catholics, uneasily aware that they were a minority, were early convinced that such a separation was their own strongest safeguard. Though Leo's views are still repeated by a few academic theologians, they are largely ignored by the U. S. hierarchy.[1]

This paragraph, then, contains the seriously misleading teaching (1) that Pope Leo XIII condemned the interrelations of Church and State which existed in his time, and which still exist, in our country, and (2) that the American hierarchy, the *Ecclesia docens* in the United States, do not teach what Pope Leo XIII taught, presumably at least on the relations between Church and State.

With reference to the first point, the truth is that Pope Leo

[1] *Time,* XLVII, 8 (Feb. 25, 1946), p. 44.

XIII did not in any way condemn the position of the government of the United States towards the Catholic Church. Quite on the contrary, he enumerated "the equity of the laws which obtain in America and the customs of the well-ordered Republic" among the factors which could be thanked for having contributed towards the marvellous growth and prosperity of the Church in this country during the nineteenth century. But, because there was need for him to do so, he insisted also upon the fact that the position of the Church in this country did not represent the absolute ideal. Furthermore he called attention to the truth that the relation which he found praiseworthy as it exists here in this country could not be duplicated laudably in every country on earth.

The only official document in which Pope Leo XIII refers to the interrelations of Church and State in this country is the encyclical *Longinque oceani,* dated Jan. 6, 1895. The pertinent passage reads as follows:

> But, moreover (a fact which it gives pleasure to acknowledge), thanks are due to the equity of the laws which obtain in America and to the customs of the well-ordered Republic. For the Church amongst you, unopposed by the Constitution and government of your nation, fettered by no hostile legislation, protected against violence by the common laws and by the impartiality of the tribunals, is free to live and act without hindrance. Yet, though all this is true, it would be very erroneous to draw the conclusion that in America is to be sought the type of the most desirable status of the Church, or that it would be universally lawful or expedient for State and Church to be dissevered and divorced in the American manner. The fact that Catholicity with you is in good condition, nay, is even enjoying a prosperous growth, is by all means to be attributed to the fecundity with which God has endowed His Church, in virtue of which, unless men or circumstances interfere, she spontaneously expands and propagates herself; but she would bring forth more abundant fruits if, in addition to liberty, she enjoyed the favor of the laws and the patronage of the public authority.[2]

In this encyclical Pope Leo listed the actual interrelations existing between the Church and the State in the United States of

[2] *Acta Sanctae Sedis,* XXVII (1894-95), p. 390. I have used the translation in *The Great Encyclical Letters of Pope Leo XIII* (New York: Benziger Brothers, 1903), pp. 323 ff.

America as a factor contributing in some measure towards the extraordinarily good situation of the Church in this land of ours. The actual American system was not condemned, but praised.

At the same time the Pope insisted that the situation in this country does not offer an example of absolutely the best status of the Church. This, of course, is obvious enough. The most desirable position of the Church is manifestly in a place in which every one is a member of the Church, and in which all are taking advantage, within the Church, of the salvific graces of Jesus Christ. Where every citizen of the State would enjoy membership in the true Church, clearly the State itself would not adopt an attitude of mere neutrality towards the Church. The burning love for souls which is within the Catholic Church by the very fact of Christ's presence within it renders this condition the best in the eyes of the Church. It is the condition the Church works to achieve.

Pope Leo taught that it would not be universally expedient or licit to have the Church and the State dissociated *more Americano* everywhere. In this statement once again he brings out his teaching on both the expediency and the liceity of the American system as it exists in this country. Plainly, however, the adoption of a system like ours would be unjust in a nation made up entirely of Catholics and hitherto making a corporate profession of the Catholic faith. Such an act, in an entirely Catholic country, would be nothing more or less than a hostile move against the government and the principles of the Church. It would involve a kind of apostasy. It would be the sort of separation of Church and State which the Roman Pontiffs have consistently and necessarily condemned.

Pope Leo XIII did, we must remember, condemn a teaching which he called and which he was justified in calling the separation of Church and State. He described the two grades of this teaching, and the descriptions he gave make it perfectly clear that the condemned teaching on the separation of Church and State is by no means an American principle.

> From this teaching [false Liberalism], as from its source and principle, flows that fatal principle of the separation of Church and State; whereas it is, on the contrary, clear that the two powers, though dissimilar in functions and unequal in degree, ought nevertheless to live

in concord, by harmony in their actions and the faithful discharge of their respective duties.

But this teaching is to be understood in two ways. Many wish the State to be separated from the Church wholly and entirely, so that in regard to every right of human society, in institutions, customs, and laws, the offices of State, and the education of youth, they would pay no more regard to the Church than if she did not exist; and, at most, would allow the citizens individually to attend to their religion in private if so minded . . . .

Others oppose not the existence of the Church, nor indeed could they; yet they despoil her of the nature and rights of a perfect society; and maintain that it does not belong to her to legislate, to judge, or to punish, but only to exhort, to advise, and to rule her subjects in accordance with their own consent and will. By such opinion they pervert the nature of this divine society, and attenuate and narrow its authority, its office of teacher, and its whole efficiency; and at the same time they aggrandize the power of the civil government to such an extent as to subject the Church of God to the empire and sway of the State, like any voluntary association of citizens . . .[3]

The two forms taken by the condemned doctrine of the separation of Church and State are that in which the State absolutely ignores the Church and that in which it subjects the Church to itself. Obviously neither of these conditions exists or has existed in this country. The principle of the separation of Church and State, condemned and rightly proscribed by Pope Leo XIII, turns out to be, then, something which has actually not the remotest connection with the United States Constitution.

The two portions of the United States Constitution which are supposed to express a basic "separation of Church and State" are the part of Article VI which provides that "no religious test shall ever be required as a qualification to any office or public trust in the United States," and the portion of the First Amendment which reads that "Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof . . ." Obviously neither in the letter of the law nor in the tradition of its administration is there any trace of opposition to the true Church, or of an attempt to ignore the Church or to subject it to the State.

[3] From the encyclical *Libertas, praestantissimum naturae,* issued June 20, 1888, *Acta Sanctae Sedis,* XX (1887-88), pp. 611 f. *The Great Encyclical Letters,* pp. 159 ff.

Essentially the separation of Church and State condemned by Pope Leo XIII and by the other Roman Pontiffs involves an opposition or hostility on the part of the rulers of the State with regard to the Church and its policies. The passage we have cited from *Libertas, praestantissimum* shows this very clearly, as do Pope Leo's other encyclical, the *Immortale Dei* and Gregory XVI's *Mirari vos*. These documents reprove those "who desire that the Church be separated from the State, and the concord between the secular and ecclesiastical authority be dissolved." They add that men who seek this separation "live in dread of an agreement which has always been fraught with good, and advantageous alike to sacred and civil interests."[4]

As it is actually used in our own times, the phrase "separation of Church and State" seems always to connote some sort of opposition towards the Catholic Church. On a decidedly infra-academic plane the expression is quite frequently employed as a shibboleth by gentlemen with the forthrightly larcenous ambition of cheating Catholic children out of the use of school busses, provided out of tax funds to which the parents of these children have contributed their share. It comes up too, and of course as an "American" principle, when, particularly in war years, certain patriots strive to keep a Catholic high school basketball team out of a gymnasium also provided by public funds.

It is, of course, perfectly possible to designate the condition existing in the United States as "a separation of Church and State." In this way it would mean simply that there is in the United States no "established Church," holding the position that the Catholic Church held long ago in the Kingdom of France and which the Anglican communion holds now in England. Even this meaning can be exaggerated when applied to the American government. It is well to remember that some of the thirteen original colonies had "establishments of religion" at the very time that the Constitution was being adopted.[5] But it is imperative that we realize

[4] The passage from the *Mirari vos* is found in the *Codicis iuris canonici fontes*, II, 751. The section from the *Immortale Dei* is in the *Acta Sanctae Sedis*, XVIII (1885-86), p. 173, and in *The Great Encyclical Letters*, p. 125.

[5] Cf. *Religious Liberty*, by M. Searle Bates (New York and London: Harper & Brothers Publishers, 1945), pp. 89 f. It is interesting to note that even Bates, whose otherwise worth-while book is spoiled by his benighted anti-Catholicism, believes that the present attitude in this country is one of co-operation rather than separation.

that the relation between Church and State, as it is found in this country, has not been and will not be condemned.

Time's second misstatement, to the effect that the American hierarchy largely ignore the views of Pope Leo XIII, is just as seriously false as the first. The great encyclical letters of Pope Leo XIII remain for all the Catholics of the world the most important sources of the Catholic teaching on the place of man in civil and economic society. The encyclicals in which Pope Leo spoke of the separation of Church and State, and which seem to be the ones which, according to *Time,* the American hierarchy largely ignores, remain, and always will remain, authorities of the utmost moment. The standard theological literature of the Church depends on these letters in matters of Church and State.

As a matter of fact there is a definite self-contradiction in *Time*'s statement about the hierarchy and Pope Leo. The magazine maintains that "a few academic theologians" still repeat Leo's views, and then asserts that these are "largely ignored" by the U. S. hierarchy. As a matter of fact the academic theologians, those who are actually engaged in teaching the science of sacred theology, exercise their teaching office only in so far as they are empowered to do so by the hierarchy. The academic theologians teaching in the University and in the various clerical seminaries act as the agents for the American bishops. If they teach the doctrine of Pope Leo, they do so at the behest of the American bishops, the men who constitute the *Ecclesia docens* in the United States. They find that doctrine in every recognized text of ecclesiology.

In teaching the doctrine of Pope Leo XIII, they set forth the ordinary teaching of the Church itself. They show that all men are called to enter the Catholic Church as members. They prove that not only in his individual capacity, but also as a member of the social order, man is bound to worship the one true God according to the type of worship which has been demanded by God Himself. Thus they hold that all individual men, and all states and other societies, are bound to adore God according to the prescriptions of the Catholic religion. This is the basic fact.

But, and this is essentially important, they likewise teach the fundamental Catholic truth that no man is permitted and empowered to prejudge the spiritual status of his fellow men. We know that all men should be Catholics, since ours is the true Church

and the true religion. But we know that we have absolutely no right to say that the individual non-Catholic is in a state of sin because he is not a member of the true Church. Furthermore, we teach and we know that the State's obligation of professing the true religion is consequent upon the actual belief of the individuals who compose the State. As long as the citizenry as a body is not converted to the Church, it would be unreasonable to look for a profession of faith from the society into which these non-Catholics are incorporated.

The U. S. hierarchy and its "academic theologians" teach the doctrine of Pope Leo on man's individual and social religious duties. Occasionally, of course, there are Catholic writers not sufficiently academic to present these views clearly and accurately. But it is incorrect to charge the men of the apostolic college in our own country with failing to teach the truth which has been set forth by the successor of the prince of the apostles.

JOSEPH CLIFFORD FENTON

The Catholic University of America,
Washington, D. C.

THE CATHOLIC CHURCH AND THE CHRISTIAN STATE

In that land in which the Catholic Church ceases to exist, the Christian State in these days ceases to exist also. If the Church is uprooted, all Christianity falls with her; for in her alone Christianity remains firm and undivided, a divine institution standing forth real and visible before the world. But let not those who destroy the Christian State think that with it they will destroy the Catholic Church. She will outlive their efforts, their sophistries, and their falsehoods; and as once, when the civilization of the ancient world was swept away by the barbarians, she gave a new life to Europe, so again, when Liberalism and Socialism, the unwelcome and disowned but most true son and heir of Liberalism, have done their evil work, she will awaken once more to life the Christian State, and bring back society from the Paganism to which it has sunk to the religion of the Cross.

—Joseph Cardinal Hergenroether, in *Catholic Church and Christian State* (London: Burns and Oates, 1876), II, 417 f.

Answers to Questions

TOUCHING THE CHALICE AT ORDINATIONS

Question: Should those who are being ordained subdeacons touch the chalice and paten in the same manner as those who are being ordained to the priesthood and is it required in the latter case that the host on the paten be directly touched?

Answer: A comparison of the wording of the rubric of the *Pontificale* for the ordination of subdeacons with that for the ordination of priests will provide the answer to the query proposed. In the former case, the empty chalice and the paten without a host are presented *per modum unius* and the grammatical structure of the rubric indicates that only the chalice is touched. The direction reads as follows: "Pontifex . . . tradit omnibus calicem vacuum cum patena vacua superposita, *quem* . . . singuli tangunt." Martinucci, it is true, directs that the candidates touch both chalice and paten, resting the index finger of the right hand on the paten, while the right thumb is in contact with the cup of the chalice (Lib. VII, Cap. III, 264). This seems to be the general practice but certainly the provision of the rubric is exactly carried out if the chalice alone is touched.

For the ordination of the priest, the chalice with wine and water and the paten with the host are *both* to be touched for the rubric here prescribes that the paten be taken between the index fingers and middle fingers of both hands: "et cuppam calicis et patenam *simul* tangunt." Certainly, so far as validity is concerned, direct contact with the host is not necessary though it is usually made. Indeed, *quoad validitatem,* the Congregation of the Holy Office has decided that even though the chalice alone or the paten only has actually come in contact with the fingers, the ordination is not to be repeated (S.C.O., 17, III, IX [1897]; 14, XII [1898]). However, the directions of the *Pontificale* should be observed exactly in the ceremony, not only what is barely sufficient for the validity of the rite but also what is directed for its correct and becoming performance.

THE MASS OF THE ANGELS AT THE FUNERAL OF A CHILD

Question: At the funeral services for a child under the age of reason, if Mass is to be celebrated, what privileges are attached to the Mass of the Angels which seems to be the one prescribed for that occasion?

Answer: While the Requiem Mass proper for the funeral of adults and for children above the age of reason is so privileged that there are few days of the year on which it may not be celebrated, no such distinction has been accorded the Mass of the Angels when it is said at the funeral of little children. Indeed, the Ritual makes provision for Mass in the order for the exsequies of adults but has no reference to a Mass in the rite for the burial of little ones. It is naturally quite proper that Mass be celebrated on this latter occasion also but the Mass of the Angels ranks only as a private votive Mass and hence may be said only on days permitting Masses of this class. On days on which private votive Masses may not be said, the Mass of the day should be celebrated (Cf. S.R.C., No. 3481, 2). The place of the Mass in the ceremony is immediately following the arrival of the funeral procession in the church and the stationing of the body before the altar. After Mass, the quasi-absolution begins with the Antiphon, *Hic (haec) accipiet,* and the Psalm, *Domini est terra,* and what follows in the Ritual (Tit. VI, Cap. 7).

BY WAY OF AMPLIFICATION

In the Jan. 1946 issue (p. 72), in reply to a question concerning the Ordo to be followed when priests say Mass in a church or chapel which has a proper Ordo, we quoted a ready-made answer from Wuest-Mullaney's *Matters Liturgical* to the effect that the calendar of the place of Mass is the one to be followed. Several correspondents have called our attention to certain aspects of this question and their observations are here given by way of amplification.

Fr. Michael Gatterer, S.J., is quoted by one as follows: "Quid juris si ecclesiae vel oratoria saecularia regularibus, regularia saecularibus vel religiosis alterius familiae ad usum et directionem traduntur? Respondeo: Si traditio est perpetua vel ad tempus in-

definitum, ecclesiae assumunt directorium novorum rectorum" (*Annus Liturgicus,* p. 166).

"Ecclesiae vel oratoria monialium, quae rectorem saecularem vel alterius religionis presbyterum habent, retinere *debent* directorium monialium, si vere officium chorale moniales habent; retinere *possunt* si moniales solummodo officium parvum B. M. V. recitare solent" (*ibid.,* p. 167).

He adds, in a footnote to the above: "Itaque in hoc casu rector oratorii seu ecclesiae directorium sororum *vel* suum proprium sequi potest. Decreta S.R.C. quae contrarium praescribunt particularia solummodo sunt."

A Franciscan Ordo, in the same connection, has the following: "Porro religiosi, proprio calendario gaudentes, eo utuntur tum in ecclesiis, quarum dominium ad ipsos pertinent, tum in iis, quae *stabili ratione* eorum curae et regimini sunt concreditae." Here the decrees of July 17, 1896; Jan. 27, 1905; Feb. 3, 1905; and Feb. 11, 1910 are offered in evidence but no distinction is made in the Ordo as to the canonical standing of the Sisters, where nuns are in question, as to whether they are *moniales* properly so called or not.

THE FEAST OF THE TITULAR OF A CHURCH ON JUNE 30, 1946

Question: In a church dedicated to St. Paul the Apostle, the patronal feast is, I believe, that of the Commemoration of St. Paul, on June 30. This year (1946) this feast comes on the Third Sunday after Pentecost, which is that within the Octave of the Feast of the Sacred Heart. In arranging the Ordo for the day, would it be correct to say the Mass of St. Paul, commemorating (1) the Sunday, and (2) St. Peter, saying the Preface of the Apostles, and reading the Gospel of the Sunday as the Last Gospel?

Answer: As the feast of the titular of a church ranks as a primary feast, *duplex primae classis,* it is celebrated with all the privileges of a feast of that rank, both in occurrence and concurrence, according to the norms summarized in the tables in front of the Breviary. Hence, on June 30, 1946, where St. Paul is the titular, the Mass will be of the Commemoration of St. Paul the Apostle. The first commemoration will be of St. Peter, in accordance with the special rubric, found in the text of the Mass of the day, directing that on a feast of St. Paul, the oration of St. Peter

has precedence over all other commemorations. (On feasts of St. Peter, likewise, the oration for St. Paul comes first among the commemorations.) The second comemoration will be of the Third Sunday after Pentecost, as a Sunday always rates a commemoration, even on the highest feasts. The Octave of the Sacred Heart, being a privileged octave of the third class, adds another oration. The prayer for the Octave of St. John the Baptist, however, since this is merely on *Octava communis,* is omitted. The proper Preface is that of the Apostles and the Last Gospel is that of the Sunday, in accordance with the rubrics of the Missal, which require that whenever a Sunday is commemorated at Mass, the Gospel of that Sunday replaces that of St. John at the end of Mass *(Add. et Var.,* IX, 1).

REQUIEM AETERNAM AND *REQUIESCAT* AT FUNERALS

Question: There seems to be considerable confusion about the VV. *Requiem aeternam* and *Requiescat* at funeral services. Is it correct to say these verses are omitted after the oration for the deceased when Mass, Absolution, or burial follows immediately?

Answer: It seems that the versicles in question are to be regarded as a liturgical *vale* of the deceased and so are said only at the end of the services or at the end of the last in a series when several services are performed in immediate succession. The Ritual (Tit. VI, Cap. III, 4) directs that the *Kyrie eleison, Pater,* various versicles, an oration, and the two concluding versicles, named above, are to be recited only when the transfer of the body to the church is not followed at once by the Office or Mass. Similarly, in the succeeding paragraph *(loc. cit.,* 5) the omission of the *Requiem aeternam* and *Requiescat* is prescribed at the end of the Office for the Dead, when that is recited immediately before the Requiem Mass or the Absolution. In the burial service itself *(loc. cit.,* 14) these versicles are found only at the very end, succeeded, in this instance only, by the *Anima ejus,* etc. They are found again, at the final conclusion of the exsequial prayers, so often neglected, but set down in the Ritual *(loc. cit.,* 15) to be recited on the way back from the cemetery to the church and in the sacristy of the latter before the vestments are laid aside.

The *Pontificale Romanum* (Pars. III) again preserves this idea of the versicles of which we are speaking as a final farewell to the deceased. When the five absolutions are given, as at the funeral of a bishop, none of the four assisting bishops, but only the principal prelate, who gives the last absolution, follows the oration with *Requiem aeternam* and *Requiescat.*

WILLIAM J. LALLOU

ADULTS IN LIMBO

Question: Does Limbo— the *Limbus puerorum*—contain any persons who have come to adult age in the present life, such as pagans who lived a naturally good life but never attained to the knowledge of the supernatural order?

Answer: It is commonly recognized as a certain theological conclusion that all unbaptized persons who reach intellectual adulthood receive actual grace that is sufficient (at least remotely) to bring them to the state of sanctifying grace and to eternal salvation (Cf. Van Noort-Verhaar, *Tractatus de Gratia Christi* [Hilversum, 1934], n. 93). If they make proper use of this grace, they are justified and (presuming they persevere) will be admitted to heaven after death. If they reject this grace, or if they fall into grave sin after justification and do not repent before death, they are justly condemned to hell. Accordingly, there is no possibility that one who has possessed the use of reason (an adult, in theological language) will leave the world with original sin but no grave actual sin on his soul. Hence, there is no place in the *Limbus puerorum* for adults.

It is true, there is difficulty in applying this doctrine to many persons in pagan lands who seem to live and die without any opportunity of making an act of supernatural faith—a necessary prerequisite to an act of justifying charity. But we must remember that God has ways of communicating His graces which are not perceived by men. It is sufficiently evident from revelation as expounded by the Catholic Church, that God wills all men, including pagans, to be saved; hence we reasonably conclude that even the most benighted savages, in some manner (perhaps by direct inspiration) receive sufficient grace to enable them to be justified by supernatural faith and charity. Perhaps, in some instances, this

grace is granted only in the last moments of life. But it surely comes, in one way or other, to every individual adult. This doctrine would include the possibility of the necessary grace being given, in its initial stage, as an intrinsically natural help to observe the natural law, whereby the pagan could dispose himself negatively for the subsequent reception of supernatural graces (Cf. Van Noort, *op. cit.*, n. 96; St. Thomas, *De veritate,* q. 14, a. 11, ad 1).

Some theologians have taught that many—if not most—pagans are to be accounted as children inasmuch as they never attain to the age of reason from the moral standpoint. Of course, if this be true, such persons are admitted to the *Limbus puerorum,* the state of everlasting natural happiness, in the life to come, whatever may have been the nature of their conduct objectively in the present life. But the view that moral childhood is to be conceded on a large scale to the inhabitants of pagan lands does not seem to possess much probability. In the normal course of events, those who attain to intellectual maturity in regard to the ordinary things of life also come to moral consciousness, the power to perceive moral right and wrong, and accordingly are adults in the theological sense.

THE PRIEST AT A NON-CATHOLIC FUNERAL

Question: Recently, on the occasion of the death of an Episcopalian who was married to a Catholic woman, but had never expressed any desire of joining the Catholic Church, these questions were discussed by the clergy of the vicinity: (1) Would a Catholic priest be permitted to lead a group of mourners in the recitation of the rosary at the wake? (2) Would a priest be permitted to assist at the services for the deceased in the Protestant church?

Answer: (1) A priest could pray privately at the wake of a non-Catholic—that is, in such wise that it is evident that he is doing so merely as a private individual, not as an official of the Catholic Church. Perhaps some might allow him to lead a group in the recitation of the rosary by virtue of this principle, inasmuch as the rosary is liturgically a private devotion. But, in practice, this argument does not seem sufficient to justify him. For those who would be present on such an occasion would not be familiar with fine liturgical distinctions, and to them the recitation of the rosary in common by a group of mourners under the leadership

of the priest would appear to be a public Catholic service for the soul of the deceased. Accordingly, although a priest might regard such an act as a very commendable deed of charity for the soul of the departed person, he should refrain from performing it because it would be, at least to all appearances, a forbidden act of *communicatio in sacris.*

(2) Of course, the priest could not take any active part in the religious services for the deceased person in the Protestant church —that is, he could not join in the hymns, prayers, etc. But, for a very good reason passive assistance could be tolerated, according to the prescription of Canon 1258, § 2. A graver reason would be required to justify the presence of a priest than that of a layman. The mere fact that the deceased man's wife is a member of the priest's parish would not suffice; but if the priest were a relative or a life-long friend of the departed he could be present passively at the funeral services.

CIVIL PROHIBITION OF MARRIAGE

Question: What is to be said of the ruling of our military authorities that American soldiers in Germany are not allowed to marry German girls?

Answer: Such legislation is unjustifiable. It strikes at a very basic human right, the right to marry a person of one's own choice. This right can, indeed, be reasonably restricted to some extent by public authority, so that it may not be used unduly to the detriment of society and of the parties concerned. Thus, it is quite reasonable that laws be passed forbidding the marriage of persons who are too young, forbidding the intermarriage of near relatives, etc. But it is certainly unreasonable to forbid a man to marry simply because the girl of his choice happens to belong to another race or nation, even though her country has recently been at war with his. There is a startling inconsistency in the fact that one of our complaints against the Nazis is that they forbade the marriage of persons supposedly of pure German stock with members of "inferior" races; and now our own authorities have imitated this procedure by forbidding American soldiers to marry German girls. It should be remembered, too, that only the Catholic Church has the right to lay down laws as to whom baptized persons

may or may not marry. For the marriage of a baptized person is a sacrament (in the event that he marries another baptized person) or at least a sacred contract of a Christian (if he marries an unbaptized person) and in either case it comes under the jurisdiction of the Church (cf. Canon 1038). And the Church has not legislated that a baptized American may not marry a girl because she happens to be a German.

SERMON STORIES

Question: Is a priest justified in telling a story to illustrate a point in his sermon, asserting that a certain incident happened to himself, when in reality it is pure fiction?

Answer: I suppose that a priest adopting this custom might justify himself on the ground that he is using these stories as parables. He might assert that it is perfectly lawful to illustrate or to confirm the lesson he wishes to convey by narrating a story as if it were factual though actually it is imaginary, just as Our Lord related the parables of the king who made a wedding feast, Dives and Lazarus, etc.—which probably never happened as particular incidents. But I would be inclined to take a less lenient view of such self-centered narratives. Doubtless the majority of the congregation understand the speaker literally, and in view of this fact it is difficult to excuse him of the venial fault of falsehood. Furthermore, the habitual practice of telling fictitious narratives is likely to have repercussions of an embarrassing nature for the preacher. For, in the course of time he may relate contradictory versions of the same story, or tell different stories which are incompatible with one another, and if some of the congregation detect this, they will be much surprised and may even begin to doubt all his statements.

FRANCIS J. CONNELL, C.SS.R.

If Jesus Christ be God, everything is consistent—His life, His doctrine, His miracles, the wonderful effects of His appearance on the earth, and even the very time and place in which He did appear.

—Msgr. Bougaud, in *The Divinity of Christ* (Baltimore, 1900), p. 193.

Analecta

The restoration of the Chapter of Canons in the Cathedral Church of the Diocese of Kilmore, Eire, is reported first among the documents published in the Sept. 1945 number of the *Acta Apostolicae Sedis*.[1] Its authorization is recorded in an Apostolic Constitution dated March 10, 1945. The purpose of the restoration is stated to be two-fold: the providing of an advisory body for the bishop and the embellishment of the acts of divine worship in the Cathedral Church. The Chapter is to consist of two dignities (a dean and an archdeacon) and thirteen canories (two of which are to be occupied by a theologian and a *penitentiarius)*. Until prebends can be established, the canons are dispensed from the obligation of residing near the Cathedral and of choir duty; and the bishop may freely appoint them, except in the case of the dignities, appointment to which is reserved to the Holy See. The first appointment to these two offices, however, is placed in the hands of the bishop. The obligations of the profession of faith and the oath against Modernism are to be fulfilled as in the case of all benefices. A set of constitutions is required for the Chapter. A member of the Chapter in the discharge of his capitular functions and within the limits of his diocese is permitted to wear red piping and red buttons on his cassock, red piping on his mozetta, a red pompom on his biretta, and a rochet.

Letters Apostolic of July 12, 1945[2] raise the Cathedral Church of Otranto the dignity of a Minor Basilica, reciting that in it are preserved the relics of the Eight Hundred Martyrs who died for their Faith and their country, whose intercession was efficacious particularly in the course of the two world wars, during which, though countless bombs were dropped over the city, not one fell within its walls, but all were buried in the sea. Moreover, on the artistic side, the Cathedral has been, since the eleventh century, so notable that it has been an object of pilgrimage.

Three letters of the Holy Father are published. One, dated Aug. 24, 1945,[3] is addressed to Alfred Cardinal Schuster, Archbishop

[1] *Acta Apostolicae Sedis,* XXXVII (1945), 225-27.

[2] *Ibid.,* pp. 227-29.

[3] *Ibid.,* pp. 229-31.

of Milan, on the occasion of the Fourth Eucharistic Congress of the Archdiocese of Milan, held at Monza. The letter alludes to the appropriateness of selecting this city as the place for the Congress inasmuch as it was here that Queen Theodolinda, supporting the efforts of Pope St. Gregory I, brought about the conversion of the ferocious Lombards and established peace between them and the inhabitants. The choice was appropriate in that the special aim of the Congress should be to remove the seeds of worldliness and revenge from the hearts of the faithful, especially the germ of hate from the soul of the laborer, in order that all may abandon the emotions that brought on war and devote themselves to the arts of peace through sacrifice, the highest example of which was manifested in the suffering and death of the Eucharistic King. The letter authorizes His Eminence to give the Apostolic Blessing with the plenary indulgence attached.

The second letter, dated Sept. 1, 1945,[4] is addressed to Most Rev. Carlo Maria Della Torre, Archbishop of Quito, Ecuador, and the hierarchy of that country on the occasion of the third centenary of the death of Blessed Marianna of Jesus de Paredes, to be celebrated with solemnity throughout that country. The letter urges the nation to follow in unselfishness the example of her who is called the Lily of Quito, and imparts the Apostolic Blessing to the whole hierarchy and to the faithful entrusted to their care.

The third letter, dated also Sept. 1, 1945,[5] is addressed to Francesco Cardinal Marmaggi, Prefect of the Sacred Congregation of the Council, on the twenty-fifth anniversary of his elevation to the episcopate. Our Holy Father recounts the affection he has fostered towards him from the earliest days of his priesthood, recalling also the offices filled by the jubilarian, especially as Nuncio to Rumania, Czechoslovakia, and Poland. The letter closes with the Apostolic Blessing.

The Sacred Congregation of Rites, according to the published record, reported on March 25, 1945,[6] the action of our Holy Father in proclaiming that sufficient evidence had been adduced as to the martyrdom and its cause in the case of the Venerable Servant of God, Maria Goretti, of the Diocese of Albano, killed in June,

[4] *Ibid.* pp. 231, 232.

[5] *Ibid.*, pp. 232, 233.

[6] *Ibid.*, pp. 234-36.

1902, in defense of her virginity against an assailant. Our Holy Father dispensed from the miracles and decreed that the process should go forward without them.

On the same day[7] the Sacred Congregation reported, in the cause of the Venerable Servant of God, Peter Donders, a priest of the Congregation of the Redemptorists, born in the Diocese of Bois-le-duc, the action of our Holy Father in proclaiming that sufficient evidence had been adduced of the practice of the theological and the cardinal virtues in heroic degree.

On the same day[8] the Sacred Congregation reported, in the cause of the Venerable Servant of God, Catherina Volpicelli, Foundress of the Institute of the Handmaids of the Sacred Heart, born in Naples, the action of our Holy Father in proclaiming that sufficient evidence had been adduced of the practice of these same virtues also in heroic degree.

On May 11, 1945[9] the Sacred Congregation reported, in the cause of the Servant of God, John of the Holy Ghost, a priest of the Congregation of the Passionists, born in the Diocese of Ripatransone, the action of our Holy Father in signing the Commission for the introduction of the cause.

RECENT PONTIFICAL APPOINTMENTS ANNOUNCED IN THE *Acta Apostolicae Sedis*

Privy Chamberlains Supernumerary of His Holiness:

Jan. 29, 1945: Very Rev. Msgrs. Pierre A. Brisse and Paul A. Deery of the Diocese of Evansville.

Feb. 4, 1945: Very Rev. Msgrs. John Joseph Daly of the Archdiocese of Baltimore and Washington; Augustine Thomas Mozier of the Diocese of Camden; Joseph J. Przudzik and George J. Schuster of the Diocese of Lincoln; Alphonse J. Bertman, William J. Cassin, Jesse L. Gatton, William F. Hang, and Bernard N. Manning of the Diocese of Springfield (Illinois).

June 8, 1945: Very Rev. Msgrs, John A. Bapst, John Biernacki, James J. Connelly, Charles J. Feltes, Clement N. Mlinarovich, John F.

[7] *Ibid.*, pp. 237-39.
[8] *Ibid.*, pp. 240-43.
[9] *Ibid.*, pp. 243-45

Nadolny, Joseph J. Seimetz, and John A. Sullivan of the Diocese of Fort Wayne.

June 30, 1945: Very Rev. Msgr. Harold J. Bolton, of the Diocese of Saginaw.

Privy Chamberlains Supernumerary of the Cap and Sword:

Nov. 1, 1944: Joseph Scott of the Archdiocese of Los Angeles and Francis P. Matthews of the Archdiocese of Omaha.

JEROME D. HANNAN

The Catholic University of America,
Washington, D. C.

THE ROAD OF LIFE

My child, be mindful day and night of God Who speaks the word to you, honoring Him as the Lord, for from whence the majesty speaks, there is the Lord. Search out daily the men who are holy, that you may hear their words. Do not create divisions, but rather bring peace to those who are fighting; judge justly, and do not raise your face to argue over transgressions. Be not wavering, whether a thing will occur or not. Be not one who holds out his hands when it is time to receive, but squeezes them together when it is time to give. If you have anything through your handiwork give it in atonement for your sins. Do not be in doubt about giving and do not murmur when you give, for you will learn who is the good rewarder. Do not turn away one who is in need, but share everything in common with your brother and do not say it is your own, for if you are partners in that which is everlasting, how much the more in mortal things. Do not withdraw your support from your son or your daughter, but from their youth teach them the fear of God. Do not give orders to your servants, who hope in the same God, in bitterness, lest they come to fear not Him Who is God over all of you, for He is not coming to call men according to their status in society, but those whom the Spirit has prepared. But you, servants, be subject to your masters as to the image of God, in reverence and fear. Hate all hypocrisy and all that which is not acceptable to the master. Do not neglect the master's commands, take care of what you have recived, neither adding to it nor taking from it. In the church confess your transgressions, and do not approach your prayers with a bad conscience. This is the road of life.

—*Didache,* IV, 1-14.

Book Reviews

JOURNEY IN THE NIGHT. By Fr. Brice, C.P. New York: F. Pustet Co., 1945. Pp. viii + 159. $2.50.

The real nature of this book is expressed more clearly in the subtitle: "A practical introduction to St. John of the Cross, and, in particular, a companion to the first book of the 'Ascent of Mt. Carmel.'" We greeted the book with great joy and anticipation, but no less was the disappointment that followed. The author gives the impression of having attempted something rather superior to his strength. A lack of a very definite plan becomes evident from the first few pages. At any rate, whatever plan may have existed in the beginning was changed as the work progressed. It is something out of proportion to limit an introduction to St. John of the Cross to the first book of one of his several works. The *Ascent of Mt. Carmel* consists of two main parts. The first part is divided into three books in which the active night of the senses and of the spirit is explained. The second part, in two books, treats of passive purifications and is called "Dark Night." We know that this work of St. John was not completed and his mystical doctrine must be supplemented with what he wrote in his other works. The first book of the first part of the *Ascent* cannot be separated from the following books without giving an incomplete and distorted idea of St. John's doctrine. Fr. Brice, realizing all this, delves not only into the other books of the *Ascent of Mt. Carmel* but also into *The Dark Night, The Spiritual Canticle, The Living Flame of Love,* ending up with the *Spiritual Sentences and Maxims.* The author candidly admits his lack of method when he writes: "When we started this modest exposition of the doctrine of John of the Cross, we had no idea that we would go to this length. Like one going for a delightful walk through the woods in spring, we were urged farther and farther by every new point of interest that greeted us" (p. 130).

Our main objection, however, is against the assumption by the author that St. John of the Cross wrote this work for the ordinary beginners in the spiritual life: "That 'the' soul is equivalent to 'any' soul desiring to become perfect is perfectly evident" (p. 13). His opinion, in this regard, is shared by several authors belonging to the so-called speculative school of thought, who make no distinction between the ascetical and mystical form of spirituality, nor between acquired and infused contemplation. No doubt, the *Ascent of Mt. Carmel* was written for beginners in the contemplative or mystical life, but not for any other sort of beginners. When St. John speaks of ascetical practices

of mortication, he does it with a view to mystical graces. This is the asceticism of the mystics, who by active purgations must co-operate in disposing their souls for the supreme union and transformation. All this is expressly stated by St. John of the Cross in his Prologue to the *Ascent of Mt. Carmel*: "Nor is my principal intention to speak to all kinds of people but to some persons of our sacred Order of the primitive observance of Mount Carmel, both friars and nuns, who have asked me for it, whom God graciously places on the path of this Mountain. These, *being already completely detached from the temporal things of this world,* will understand better the doctrine of the nudity of the spirit" (*Subida del Monte Carmelo. Prólogo,* 9). These contemplative religious, completely detached from the temporal things of this world, are far more than mere beginners in the spiritual life. In the same Prologue (No. 3), St. John says that God places the souls in this dark night, that He can carry them without their co-operation. This implies a certain passivity on the part of the soul, the passivity of the mystical state. St. John of the Cross attributes to his beginners a mystical form of prayer, the prayer of quiet (Book I, II), infused contemplation (Book II, 13), imaginative visions (Book II, 16), divine locutions (*ibid.,* 19). These are mystical graces and we know that not all beginners and advanced souls enjoy such favors. To say that St. John wrote for every beginner in the spiritual life means that every beginner is a mystic in the strict sense of the word. This is contradicted by experience.

PASCAL P. PARENTE

MIND THE MASS. By Rev. Joseph A. Dunney. New York: Benziger Brothers, 1945. Pp. xii + 238. $2.50.

Father Dunney's latest book on the Mass must be judged by its simple claim to be no more than a series of meditations on the Holy Sacrifice for better understanding of the supreme act of the official worship of the Church, so that we may better know the things we should know and better perform the things we ought to do. Nothing profound or original is promised to the reader. The eucharistic reflections have as their purpose to make "our own inner life conform to the divine pattern."

The book is accordingly an analysis, with pious comments, of the various stages of the Holy Sacrifice, covered in thirty-seven chapters. We wonder why no mention is made of the Gradual, Alleluia, or Tract and why, after the observations suggested by the offering of the Host, there is no commentary on the series of prayers accompanying and following the oblation of the chalice. We look in vain also for any

expression of thoughts inspired by the dramatic rite of the breaking of the Host. Again, the section following the Communion jumps abruptly from the reception of the Sacred Species by priest and people to the Last Gospel. The space given to comments on the prayers at the foot of the altar seems to us disproportionately long. On the other hand, the reflections on the five "epithets" of the *Quam oblationem* and the seven petitions of the *Pater noster* appeal to us as in perfect proportion.

Mind the Mass, while no adequate substitute for so classical a work as Chaignon's *The Holy Mass Worthily Celebrated,* may be recommended as a book containing "a little new of the ever old" among commentaries on that sacrifice which is the focus of Catholic worship.

WILLIAM J. LALLOU

FACT AND FICTION IN MODERN SCIENCE. By Henry V. Gill, S.J. New York: Fordham University Press, 1945. Pp. iii + 136. $2.50.

The purpose of this book of fourteen essays is, according to the publisher's foreword, to provide Catholics and those not of the faith with studies upon important issues of latest scientific research, made from the Catholic point of view. I do not think that the present work fulfills this purpose completely.

It is obvious that the author has no first hand acquaintance with modern physical theory and no sympathy whatever with it. This shows itself in those essays which deal with subjects belonging, not to the general questions which occur in science and border on philosophy, but to specific scientific problems.

In accord with Gill's training in one of the foremost experimental laboratories of the world, the third essay, which describes the experimental findings on the constituents of matter is quite good, even if some minor errors occur. In essays eleven and five there occurs the only discussion of a subject to which might be attached the title "fiction of modern science." Here the author discusses and rejects the theory of the "expanding universe" the most important representative of which is Canon Lemaitre of Louvain. Gill's objection to it is that we can learn only what the state of the more remote stars was millions of years ago, since it takes the light so long to reach us. This is quite true but if one wishes to keep this cautious standpoint, one must refrain from making any statement about the stellar universe as a whole; it is not a question of replacing a bad theory by a good theory, but of not having any theory at all.

The fifth essay, called "Logic and Science," heavily attacks the mod-

ern theories of physics. He objects that "Bohr made several hypotheses, which had no other justification than that they fitted in with facts of observation." Scientists and, I think, Scholastic Philosophy are in agreement that this *is* the principal justification for making any hypothesis. What else would Gill wish? Kant's and Eddington's *a priori* ideas? Later on he says "Another remarkable feature of modern theory is a tendency to overlook common sense objections." The makers of modern theory know the history of science and remember that Columbus would not have discovered America and Copernicus never have written his epoch-making work had they listened to common sense objections.

KARL F. HERZFELD

CHUNKING LISTENING POST. By Mark Tennien. New York: Creative Age Press, Inc., 1945. Pp. 201. $2.50.

In this very vivid account of his experiences during the war years in China, another Maryknoll missionary, the Reverend Mark Tennien, takes his place as one of the more interesting and informative writers of that exciting period. Dispatched from his mission at Wuchow to establish a mission distribution office in Chungking just after the fateful Dec. 8, 1941, he came into active co-operation with the many newsmen and correspondents at the Chungking radio station; as fiscal agent for the sixty-two bishops and 1,600 Catholic missioners in Free China, he was the common center for the news of all sorts received and sent; he was at once the correspondent, the counselor, the agent, the representative, the chaplain to the rich and the poor, the strong and the weak, soldier and civilian; he was truly in a listening post.

He tells a very interesting story and in a very convincing style. The author's materials are unlimited and he takes great pains to present them with accuracy, sometimes to the point of interrupting the interest of the story. But for those who want an accurate picture of facts and conditions which might otherwise test one's credulity, the author's effort will be welcomed. Several pages of illustrations add to the interest of the book.

F. A. MULLIN

EASTERN CATHOLIC WORSHIP. By Donald Attwater. New York: Devin-Adair, 1945. Pp. xviii + 224. $2.50.

This slender volume is unique and appealing; its editor has done Catholic readers and many others a new service for which we can be grateful. He has put into an attractive English rendering the official

prayers of the Divine Liturgy as celebrated by Eastern Catholics of all rites. Each liturgy has been provided with a suitable short introduction and with enough details of the action by the sacred ministers to make possible an intelligent following of the prayers. As a familiar standard for comparison, the ordinary and canon of the Roman Mass, with details of the ceremonies for Solemn Mass, are given at the end. The liturgies represented are: the Byzantine liturgy of St. John Chrysostom; the Armenian liturgy; the liturgies of the Copts in Egypt and of the Ethiopians; the west-Syrian and Maronite liturgies; and the Chaldean liturgy with that of the Malabar coast of India.

An introduction "About Eastern public worship in general" gives in compact and lucid form just enough information so that any Catholic reader can feel quite at home in the pages that follow. Though, as Mr. Attwater explains, "the originals of most of these liturgies are in very uncommon languages" a number of them have been available in some form in English or in other languages of the West before now. They have, however, been scattered; the renderings have been based on the usage among dissident groups, so that the variety of rites within the Catholic Church received no adequate testimony; and they have inclined to make much of obsolete practice rather than to describe current forms. No historic rite in which the true Christian sacrifice is offered in any Eastern language at present remains without representation in this volume; for there is now no dissident group among Oriental Christians which remains without Catholic brethren who use the same rite. In the United States and Canada right now, one in every twenty-five Catholics shares in offering to God the Body and Blood of Christ according to one of these rites different from the Latin Mass. The solemn celebration of these ancient and beautiful liturgies in our cathedrals, seminary chapels and larger churches is spreading, and will, let us hope, spread further.

The present volume, therefore, lends itself to use in actually following the services it describes. It is also excellent study-club material, and should be overlooked by no one who is interested in penetrating further into the spirit of the prayers in the Roman Mass itself. Also as a meditation-book and source of possible private devotions it has the merit of containing treasures hallowed by the tradition of many centuries and sealed with the approval of the universal Church.

PATRICK W. SKEHAN

THE SPLENDOR OF THE ROSARY. By Maisie Ward, with prayers by Caryll Houselander, with pictures by Fra Angelico. New York: Sheed and Ward, 1945. Pp. 134. $2.50.

Though you may have recited the rosary for twenty, forty or more

years, you may be startled with the fresh ideas this book will supply. If you are a non-Catholic and have always been curious about the "beads" you will find a clear and practical chapter on the structure, and various methods of reciting the rosary. And there is a beautiful chapter on Fra Angelico, who though he never depicted a saint with rosary in hand, has left on the walls of San Marco and elsewhere scores of masterpieces that body forth the fifteen splendid mysteries of this devotion. The book is enhanced by fifteen reproductions of Fra Angelico introducing each in turn the chapter on the particular mystery. And if you like Caryll Houselander's "rhythms," she has specially composed fifteen prayer-rhythms to supplement the author's doctrinal sidelights on the mysteries.

As you peruse *The Splendor of the Rosary* many shining examples will throng into mind: St. Clement Hofbauer calling the rosary his *library;* Lourdes too, and Our Lady herself praying the rosary with little Bernadette; Fr. Peyton and his Family Rosary Crusade; and the Marine in the Pacific making the startling discovery that a hand grenade has fifty notches . . . and for want of something better, using it for a rosary!

There is plenty material in the book for private mediation; for public sermons too. It will help the new convert to understand the secret springs of Catholic prayer and meditation. It will come as a God-send to many a fervent soul dissatisfied with its present manner of "saying the beads." And it should be to all, as Maisie Ward intends it, a guide to reality. There is nothing more real than God.

JAMES GALVIN, C.SS.R.

PSYCHOLOGIA IN USUM SCHOLARUM. Editio emendata et aucta. By G. Esser, S.V.D. Techny, Ill.: Mission Press, 1945. Pp. xvi + 499. $3.00.

Many priests who have studied psychology only as a part of philosophy, concerned with the ultimate aspects of man's faculties and nature, have found it difficult to correlate their course with the opinions of modern psychologists which they meet in later reading. It is the chief merit of Fr. Esser's manual that, although he is concerned primarily with philosophical psychology, he also fits in summaries of the carefully checked and methodically tabulated data of empiric science. The philosophical implications of the views of modern influential writers, such as James, Watson, Freud and Kuelpe, are given adequate treatment; and remarkably extensive references to contemporary books and magazines are provided.

While the usual distinction between experimental and philosophical psychology is well illustrated (n. 3), it is not exact to speak of the latter as being synonymous with speculative psychology, since empiric study is also, of itself, speculative. Neither is it proper to call philosophical psychology, taken as a whole, a "part of metaphysics;" at least the study of sensitive being belongs to the philosophy of nature, which is science in the first degree of abstraction, not the third.

More than in most manuals, account is given of differences of opinion among Scholastics, to such an extent that the author merely recounts the arguments of both sides, stating a final preference for neither, on such points as the objective existence of sensible qualities, the distinctions among the internal senses, the mode of knowing singular objects, and the essence of the act of judgment. Such implied electicism might bewilder a beginner, especially since the arguments given for conflicting views are not always equally sound. However, the method has the advantage of manifesting the liberty of opinion possible within the essential unity of Scholasticism; and in the classroom, a teacher can readily aid the learner to evaluate the various arguments. Frequently, the proponents of disputed views are referred to merely as *"Alii . . . alii . . ."* and while this may be a means of preventing acceptance of opinions because of their connection with "big names," yet it also has the disadvantage of not manifesting the consistency and continuity of the doctrines of different schools on interconnected points.

It is worthy of notice and commendation that the *vis cogitativa,* intuition, and attention receive more discussion than is generally accorded in Scholastic manuals. Especially praiseworthy are the practical suggestions on attention (nn. 406-16) and on strength of will (nn. 543-44). One misses, however, a treatment of the nature of cogniton in general, in which the need and function of cognitive *species* could be established, later to be applied to the different types of knowledge. The Aristotelian definition that is given as that of the sensitive soul — *actus primus corporis physici organici vitam in potentia habentis* (n. 323) — really applies to any soul, including that of the merely vegetative order. If psychology is to be restricted to the study of sensitive and intellectual beings, traditional definitions that apply to all living things should be properly adapted.

The Latin style is simple and clear, and the use of the manual for consultation on special points is facilitated by very complete indices. Although intended chiefly as a classroom text, this almost encyclopedic synthesis would admirably serve anyone interested in a comprehensive review of what can be known of man's various powers of knowledge and appetition, by scientific observation and philosophical reasoning.

JOSEPH M. COLLERAN, C.SS.R.

SELF REVELATION OF THE ADOLESCENT BOY. By Urban H. Fleege, S.M., Ph.D. Milwaukee: The Bruce Publishing Co., 1945. Pp. xiv + 384. $3.50.

Within the pages of this book one finds a detailed picture of the present day Catholic adolescent boy: his background, attitude toward home, school, and church, his problems, desires, and frustrations.

The factual data contained in this comprehensive study was obtained from a most reliable source, the boy himself, as revealed in the answers of two thousand high school boys to two hundred selected questions.

In the opening section of the book, the author persents the method used in conducting the "problemmaire" which he has developed, and the check-questions used in making as objective as possible what must of its very nature be a subjective study. The comments of the boys participating clearly indicate their enthusiasm for a project which enables them to ventilate their problems anonymously. It is believed that the factual information obtained by this study can be regarded as being as reliable as possible with any present day large-scale techniques.

The environmental factors encountered in the home are studied and the boy's estimate of his parents and their shortcomings in their relations with him are presented along with commentaries by the author which will indicate to parents the lines along which improvements can be made. Fathers will probably be surprised and perhaps a bit piqued to learn that only fifty-one per cent. of them are regarded by their sons as understanding the problems of youth, while mothers do somewhat better, with, however, only sixty-seven per cent. being placed in the "understanding" category. We are relieved, however, to learn that after overall appraisal, the author feels confident that ninety per cent. of the boys are fairly well adjusted at home.

The percentages of our high school students, who are adapted for, and who do in fact, attend college are presented and the question is raised as to whether or not our present standard academic course is the most practical for all our students. The author feels, and we agree, that it would be well if more of our Catholic high schools re-examined their curricula with critical eye and considered certain revisions necessary to meet the needs of present-day students.

Many educators have pointed out the weakness of our high schools in the field of vocational guidance and this study re-emphasizes the need for providing proper facilities, particularly in the senior year, for the student to receive advice relative to his future occupation. There is an excellent discussion of the teacher-pupil relationship, and many teachers could profit well by reading the frank comments and reactions

of their pupils relative to problems which arise from a mistaken attitude on the rostrum rather than "on the benches." When we find approximately twenty per cent. of our group feeling that the religious courses are impractical and that they are "fed up" with it, a review of our approach to the subject is indicated. Dr. Fleege has some pertinent suggestions which may aid in finding a remedy for this unfortunate situation.

It is in the section of social adjustments that we find the psyche of the adolescent boy revealed most frankly and here the author clearly demonstrates his complete understanding and sympathy for the boy as he passes through this, the most labile period of his emotional life.

With the same progressive and practical viewpoint that dominates the book, the author at this point calls attention to the desirability of providing opportunities for dances and other social gatherings under the auspices of the school and Church. If these agencies fail in making these provisions, we must not be surprised when we find the adolescent seeking companionship in questionable places. Drinking and the reasons for it are discussed and it is interesting to note the verbal reply to the question "Why drink?" as given by adolescents is not much different, nor more informative, than the replies given by their adult counterparts. It is a minor point that one has to take exception to the statement that alcohol stimulates sexual impulses directly. Pharmacologically a depressant throughout, alcohol acts as an apparent sexual stimulant only by removing cortical inhibitions.

A separate chapter is devoted to an analysis of the influence of the movies as a potent educational force in the life of the adolescent. The findings should act as a stimulus to further action on the part of those who have been attempting to clean up the movies.

As many investigators have previously shown, it is in the realm of sexual matters that the adolescent has his outstanding difficulties. The author correctly condemns the evasive attitude taken by some parents, teachers, and priests and indicates a sensible, helpful approach to the problem through the medium of proper sex education.

To those who may find the statistical approach a trifle tedious, the author has written an excellent final chapter in which the results of the analysis are presented in the form of a composite boy.

The print is easily read, the format pleasing, and the generous use of pictographs emphasizes the more important statistical findings. Dr. Fleege has made a definite contribution to our understanding of the adolescent boy. The book is enthusiastically recommended to all who deal with youth in any capacity.

JOHN LEARY, M.D.

Book Notes

Made up of twenty-nine meditations whose motive is the achievement of a continuous consciousness of eternal things, *Meditations on Eternity for Religious,* by the Venerable Mother Julienne Morrell, O.P. (New York: F. Pustet Co., 1945. $2.50) is intended as a guide for an annual retreat. There are six supplementary considerations to be used as preparatory exercises for religious profession. The translators, hiding under the anonymity of "Dominican nuns of Menlo Park, California," had sufficient facility in both French and English to hide almost completely the fact that this is a translation. They were kind enough to preface the work with a short but apt sketch of the career of Mother Julienne. These meditations have evidently stood the test of three centuries, as aids to holiness. Newly translated into English, they should still appeal to our religious communities of sisters.

In preparing her dissertation on *Rufinus, the Translator* (Washington: The Catholic University of America Press, 1945. Pp. xiii + 100. $1.00) Sr. M. Monica Wagner, C.S.C., has performed a very special service for those interested in Patrology. In line with a very sensible approach, breaking down data before making statements and judgments with regard to the knowledge, technique and procedure of Fathers of the Church in their literary as well as in their theological works, Sr. Monica has prepared an analysis of Rufinus' Latin version of the nine Greek sermons of St. Gregory of Nazianzus. Rufinus has been badly treated in history on two scores. First, because he was the enemy of St. Jerome, and secondly, because modern philologists, in pursuit of the original Greek text of Origen, decry his nonliteral translations. Sr. Monica ably points out the fact that Rufinus followed a consistent translation technique well within his competence and aim. She does this by a discriminating selection of passages, structural modifications, and citations. Preliminary to her study, she gives an up-to-the-moment survey of the place of Rufinus in modern historical investigation. Unfortunately, she seems to have neglected the most recent (1945) study on Rufinus emanating from her own university: Father Murphy's *Rufinus of Aquileia (345-411) His Life and Works.* Strangely enough, in her own English version of Rufinus' preface, she is guilty of a Rufinian lapse. She translates: "in quo utrum nostri sermonis paupertas an ipsa interpretationis natura hoc agat, tu, *qui utriusque linguae habes peritiam,* magis probato." as: "and with this in mind, be the more ready to approve my efforts, whether the poverty of our language or the very nature of translation be at fault." For the Greek and Latin minded Patrologist, the whole book will be of interest. For the ordinary student, its first two chapters are well worth perusal.

St. Thomas d'Aquin, Rites et Prières de la Messe (Textes Spirituels, Montreal: Éditions de l'Arbre, 1945. Pp. 40. $0.25) is divided into three parts, each part an article from question eighty-three of the third part of the *Summa theologica.* Only in the first part, dealing with the immolation of Christ in the Mass, is there found any commentary on the article by the compiler, Fr. Parent, O.P. In a few pages, he explains what St. Thomas means in the article when he says that the Mass is the representation of the Passion. Around this single action the Church has grouped other ceremonial prayers and actions, which dispose the faithful so that they might receive more fully the fruits of the Passion. Part Two explains the prayers of the Mass, and Part Three explains the ceremonial actions, such as the washing of hands at the *Lavabo.* Those interested in the present Liturgical revival should find this work of great interest, giving, as it does, the thoughts of St. Thomas on the meaning of the liturgy of the Mass.

La Liberté des Enfants de Dieu (Montreal: Éditions de L'Arbre, 1945. Pp. 41. $0.25) is a collection of texts from St. Thomas Aquinas which give the Christian attitude toward freedom and toward divine law. The texts are joined by a few lines of summary, written by the compiler J. M. Parent, O.P. The work is divided into three parts. The first part shows that ability to sin is not a perfection of free will, but due to an imperfection of the nature in which the will is found. The second part sees law as an external aid to perfect liberty, *i.e.*, as strengthening it in the pursuit of the true good. The internal aid to liberty, namely charity, is treated in the third part. Exception might be taken to a sentence of the compiler found on p. 14 which reads: "In fact, so long as God is not seen intuitively in His essence, He remains for man an object of free and, consequently, of meritorious choice." This is based on a passage of St. Thomas quoted immediately after this sentence. But it seems that the proper distinction by the compiler would have made this passage itself more understandable. For souls in Purgatory are no longer capable of merit, though they do not yet possess the Beatific Vision. They are no longer free to change their choice of ultimate end, since this arises from a certain changeability of the subject which ceases with death (as stated on pp. 10 f. of the booklet). All in all, however, this is an instructive brochure; it leaves one wishing only that it were longer.

In *Saint Thomas D'Aquin: Richesse et Pouvreté* (Montreal: Éditions de L'Arbre, 1945. Pp. 47. $0.25), J. M. Parent, O.P., presents a "synthetic" opusculum of the Angelic Doctor. The first part treats of human happiness and riches, and contains the basic teachings of St. Thomas on the role of riches in attaining happiness, on the dangers of riches, and on temporalities and divine Providence. The second part considers the various Christian virtues having a bearing on riches, namely, liberality, charity, justice, and voluntary poverty. For the most part the author gives us St. Thomas. Occasionally he elaborates. Perhaps this latter element, once introduced, could have been treated more amply. To see St. Thomas and *Quadragesimo anno* referred to in the one text leads one inevitably to hope for some pertinent ideas on social justice and social charity. The precise state of need evoking an obligation of almsgiving could have been more completely explained. However, this brochure remains a handy summary of spiritual principles concerning riches and poverty.

The Newman Bookshop, Westminster, Md., has added another useful work to the long list of books reprinted during the war years when they had become unavailable in this country. It is *The Spiritual Doctrine of Father Louis Lallemant, S.J.* (Pp. xvi + 304. $3.00). The great value of this work was recognized by Father Faber, the founder of the London Oratory, at whose suggestion an English translation from the French original was made by an unknown person and published for the first time in the year 1855. This reprint is substantially the same, except for the recasting of a few phrases, some notes, and references to quotations, as the 1928 edition by Alan G. McDougall. The *Spiritual Doctrine of Father Lallemant* is a book of lasting value. It should find its place in every collection of spiritual books.

In *The Lance of Longinus* (New York: MacMillan, 1946. Pp. 166. $2.00) Prince Hubertus Zu Loewenstein presents a carefully written psychological study of the struggle the Roman Centurion went through before arriving at complete surrender to the Son of God. Longinus, the Prince writes, was "the only man of whom we know, who, literally, has ever been washed in the blood and water that flowed from the very heart of the Paschal Lamb." Skillful mingling of historical fact, geographical data (not always too accurate in regard to the topography of Jerusalem), archeological lore, and fancy, results in an edifying tale, powerful and beautiful in places, but also at times rather heavy reading.

Books Received

ACCORDING TO THE PATTERN. The Story of Dr. Agnes McLaren and the Society of Catholic Medical Missionaries. By Katherine Burton. New York and Toronto: Longmans, Green and Co., 1946. Pp. 252. $2.50.

AMERICA ON TRIAL BEFORE A PROSTRATE WORLD. By Rev. Clement H. Crock. New York: Jos. F. Wagner, Inc., 1946. Pp. 128. $2.00

CAEREMONIALE. PARS PRIOR, DE MINISTRIS. By J. F. van der Stappen and A. Croegart. Fifth edition. Malines: H. Dessain, 1945. Pp. xiv + 483.

A CATHOLIC LOOKS AT THE WORLD. By Francis E. McMahon. New York: Vanguard Press, 1945. Pp. x + 334. $2.75.

THE CHINESE CONSTITUTION. A Study of Forty Years of Constitution-making in China. By Pan Wei-Tung, Ph.D. Washington: Institute of Chinese Culture, 1946. Pp. x + 327.

ECONOMIC ANALYSIS AND PROBLEMS. By John F. Cronin, S.S., Ph.D. New York: American Book Co., 1945. Pp. xv + 623. $3.75.

FORMING A CHRISTIAN MENTALITY. By Kilian J. Hennrich, O.F.M. Cap. New York: Jos. F. Wagner, Inc., 1945. Pp. xii + 288. $2.75.

FRANCISCAN EDUCATION AND THE SOCIAL ORDER IN SPANISH NORTH AMERICA, 1502-1821. By Pius J. Barth. Chicago, 1945. Pp. xi + 431.

GUERRILLA PADRE IN MINDANAO. By Edward Hagerty. New York and Toronto: Longmans, Green and Co., 1946. Pp. xii + 257. $2.75.

HISTORY OF THE CATHOLIC CHURCH. By Rev. F. Mourret, S.S. Translated by Rev. N. Thompson. Vol. VI. St. Louis: B. Herder Book Co., 1945. Pp. viii + 656. $4.00.

THE INCARNATION OF THE WORD OF GOD BY ST. ATHANASIUS. Translated by a Religious of C.S.M.V., with an introduction by C. S. Lewis. New York: The MacMillan Co., 1946. Pp. 96. $1.50.

MASTER AND MODEL. By Rev. Simon Conrad, O.F.M. Cap. Westminster, Md.: The Newman Book Shop, 1946. Pp. 123. $1.50.

MEDITATIONS ON THE PASSION. Compiled from various Sources with an Introduction by Rev. Reginald Walsh, O.P. Westminster, Md.: The Newman Book Shop, 1946. Pp. vii + 305. $3.75.

MISSION FOR SAMARITANS. By Anna Dengel, M.D. Milwaukee: The Bruce Publishing Co., 1946. Pp. x + 126. $1.75.

A PHILOSOPHY OF POETRY. By John Duffy, C.SS.R. Washington: The Catholic University of America Press, 1945. Pp. xi + 258. $2.75.

THE PRIEST GOES TO WAR. A Pictorial Outline of the Work of the Catholic Chaplains in the Second World War. New York: The Society for the Propagation of the Faith, 1946. $1.00.